









THE  
FORTNIGHTLY  
REVIEW.

EDITED BY  
JOHN MORLEY.

*N<sup>o</sup> 427-28*  
*12*  
*393*  
*19*

VOL. XXV. NEW SERIES.

JANUARY 1 TO JUNE 1, 1879.

(VOL. XXXI. OLD SERIES.)

LONDON:  
CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.  
1879.

[The Right of Translation is reserved.]

052

1918

1918

1918

LONDON:

PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO, LIMITED,  
CITY ROAD

Sitarpara Janki Public Library,

Acq. No. 10379 Date 16.6.76.

# CONTENTS.

AUTHOR.	PAGE
ALLEN, Grant . . . . .	A Problem in Human Evolution . . . 778
ARNOLD, Matthew . . . . .	<i>Ecce Convertimur ad Gentes</i> . . . . . 238
ATKINSON, Edward . . . . .	American View of Competition . . . 383
BEAR, W. E. . . . .	Agricultural Depression . . . . . 253
	The Liberal Party and the Farmers . . 435
BOURNE, R. H. F. . . . .	Malta . . . . . 877
CAMPBELL, Sir G. . . . .	Black and White in Southern States . . 449
	" " . . . . . 588
	Egypt . . . . . 787
CHESNEY, Colonel. . . . .	The Indian Finances . . . . . 842
CONWAY, M. D. . . . .	Thomas Paine . . . . . 397
COURTNEY, L. H. . . . .	A Fair Day's Wages for Fair Day's Work 417
DALE, R. W. . . . .	Liberal Candidates . . . . . 904
DUCLIE, Earl of . . . . .	Philip II. in England . . . . . 718
DUNCKLEY, Henry . . . . .	A Few Words on Mr. Dillwyn's Motion 866
EDITOR . . . . .	Plain Story of the Zulu War . . . . . 329
	Further Remarks on the Zulu War . . 546
	The French Republic and the Catholic Church . . . . . 647
FREEMAN, E. A. . . . .	Shall we give up Greek ? . . . . . 290
FYTCHIE, Lt.-Gen. . . . .	Burma . . . . . 627
GILBERT, William . . . . .	London Medical Schools . . . . . 47
GRANT DUFF, M. E. . . . .	Sir Stafford Northcote: a Rejoinder . . 131
	Chesterfield's Letters . . . . . 824
HARRISON, Frederic . . . . .	English School of Jurisprudence ( <i>Conclusion</i> ) . . . . . 114
	The Choice of Books . . . . . 491
	First Impressions of the New Republic . 353
HOUGHTON, Lord . . . . .	Phenomena of the Imagination . . . 62
LAVELEYE, Emile de . . . . .	Italian Politics . . . . . 531
LESLIE, T. E. C. . . . .	Political Economy and Sociology . . . 25
	The Known and Unknown in Political Economy . . . . . 934

AUTHOR.		PAGE
MACDONELL, James . . . .	Paris under the Restoration . . . .	912
MILL, J. S. . . . .	Chapters on Socialism. I. . . . .	217
	„ „ II. . . . .	373
	„ „ III. . . . .	513
MYERS, F. W. H. . . . .	Virgil . . . . .	163
NORMAN, Sir Henry . . . .	The Scientific Frontier . . . . .	1
MAINE, Sir Henry S. . . .	Ancient Ideas as to the Arrangement of Codes . . . . .	761
MCCULLOCH, David . . . .	Canadian Protection Vindicated . . . .	748
PEARSON, Charles H. . . .	Democracy in Victoria . . . . .	688
POLE, William . . . . .	Conventions at Whist . . . . .	576
POLLOCK, Frederick . . . .	William Kingdon Clifford . . . . .	667
POWELL, G. Baden . . . .	Reform in Victoria . . . . .	950
REID, T. Wemyss . . . . .	Rural Roumania . . . . .	80
SAINTSBURY, George . . . .	Chamfort and Rivarol . . . . .	96
SIDGWICK, Henry . . . . .	Economic Method . . . . .	301
	What is Money? . . . . .	563
STATHAM, H. H. . . . .	The Musical Cultus of the Present Day .	891
THORNTON, W. T. . . . .	Supplementary Plea for Peasant Pro- prietors . . . . .	608
TROLLOPE, Anthony . . . .	George Henry Lewes . . . . .	15
TYLOR, G. B. . . . .	The History of Games . . . . .	735
TYNDALL, Professor . . . .	The Electric Light . . . . .	197
WEDDERBURN, Sir David . .	A Japanese Romance . . . . .	273
ZINCKE, F. Barham . . . .	Pauperism and Territorialism . . . .	807
Urgency of Bankruptcy Legislation . . . . .		469
Home and Foreign Affairs. . . . .	152, 319, 486, 636, 798, 963	

THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CXLVII. NEW SERIES.—MARCH 1, 1879.

THE PLAIN STORY OF THE ZULU WAR.

THOSE who know that politics ought after all to be nothing more abstruse than good common sense, know also that the strongest and most substantial reason against the policy of intermeddling in the affairs of other nations, lies in the fact that the people and government of England have at least as much as they can do if they attend to their own affairs. Now that at length Philip drunk has once more become Philip sober, we awake to the circumstance that while people were burning to go to war to add or subtract this or the other sandjak in Eastern Roumelia, or to save the mighty Batoum, at that very moment we were being slowly and deliberately drawn into a war in our own dominions, of no trifling gravity either in itself or in its future consequences. When our memorable fit of ardour for those brilliant patriots and noble souls, the marauding and kidnapping Lazis, was at its fullest, the experiment was tried of suggesting to various companies of men of more than average interest and intelligence in political things, that troubles were brewing in the Cape. In no case did anybody present either know or care two straws about the Cape or its troubles. The newspapers and politicians who talked with most unction about our imperial responsibilities and national duties, were most impatient at a hint that these responsibilities extend to our present borders, and that national duties imply the vigilant and businesslike supervision of the doings of our own agents and representatives, and not merely a delirious jealousy of the agents and representatives of Russia, of Germany, or of any other power. Our responsibility has found us out at last. A military disaster has done what rational remonstrance could not do, and one is almost tempted to think that the two or three hundred brave men who lost their lives on the 22nd of January, lost them to good purpose if their fate rouses the nation to consider the origin of the war—a war which the nation knew and knows very little about; which the nation's government never sanctioned; which some of the most

competent people on the spot believe to be unnecessary and gratuitous; and which the evidence of the papers now shows to have been the work of one high-handed official, avowedly acting on maxims that have never been accepted by public opinion, and that are not more grossly immoral than they are grossly impolitic.

We must begin this detestable story at the beginning, and the beginning is more and more clearly seen to have been the annexation of the Transvaal. It is impossible for any candid reader to close the blue-books without a conviction that the present war is the direct result of that unfortunate measure, and those who have mastered as it deserves to be mastered the far-reaching truth that morality is only another word for the nature of things, will find a strong illustration of it in the fact that the high-handed lawlessness which began with the annexation of the Transvaal, led on to the high-handed lawlessness which has produced the war with the Zulus. As I shall presently urge, after the Transvaal had been annexed, it would have been wiser as well as more equitable to pursue towards the Zulus a policy of conciliation; but it is as true in the great affairs of nations as in the little affairs of individuals, that to have done wrong once makes it easy to go on in doing wrong. In April, 1877, Sir Theophilus Shepstone issued an address to the inhabitants of the Transvaal, proclaiming and making known that "from and after the publication hereof the territory heretofore known as the South African Republic . . . shall be, and shall be taken to be, British Territory." What was the South African Republic? It was an independent state, set up by Dutch colonists who had migrated across the Vaal, to avoid the restrictions and impediments imposed on black labour by the English in the lands on this side of the Vaal. It is thirty years since these runaway subjects set up their republic, and in 1852 its independence was recognised by the English government. To proceed, as Sir Theophilus Shepstone did in 1877, to destroy this independent state was, in the words of a writer on the matter who is on his own side, as if the rulers of Germany were to say that in their opinion the existence of a Switzerland in Europe is deleterious and dangerous, and that therefore they would abolish Switzerland as a republic, and annex its territory. The Swiss might say that their country is well governed; the Germans might reply that they thought otherwise, and as they were the stronger, their opinion must prevail. Where is the difference? The Transvaal government was a government of Europeans, and not a kingdom of barbarians. The people do not want us. They were contented with their condition, and preferred that with all its perils and drawbacks, to a safer condition under the English flag. It is in vain that we assure them that annexation

will be better for them. They do not agree with us. Then, we say, dropping the decent mask, Whether it is better for you or not, it will be better for us; it will make our position rather safer; it suits us to take your territory and extinguish your independence, and that is an end of it. So by the right of the strongest we proclaim that from and after the publication hereof, what has been yours shall be, and shall be taken to be, ours.

These proceedings were carried out without the sanction of the government at home. That Sir T. Shepstone went beyond his instructions no one disputes, but this is a point not worth pressing at the moment, because his action was ratified and its results adopted by the Secretary for the Colonies in Downing Street. It is painful to introduce into this odious story the name of a statesman who has distinguished himself so honourably not only for his steady vision and solid judgment during the most trying crisis of our generation, but for the rarer courage and sincerity which drove him to sacrifice power, friends, and as it may prove, a career, rather than lend even a tacit and formal sanction to the policy of colleagues with whom he could not agree. But it was Lord Carnarvon's impatience for a South African Confederation which led him to ratify the annexation of the Transvaal. By an accident, his name had been bound up with that other large scheme of Confederation, which had been devised by Brown and Macdonald in Canada, and which had been sent with the approval of Canadian opinion to the Colonial Office. It was not unnatural that having had occasion to think so much about confederation in North America, Lord Carnarvon should have been drawn to think about it as a solution of a very difficult situation in South Africa. Whether confederation is or is not to be the end of the difficulty, I need not now discuss. It will be a sinister day for the natives when power is placed in the hands of a Confederated parliament of colonists. On the other hand, it will be a sinister day for England, if she takes the government of their vast territories into her own hands, and administers them as she administers India. As a third course, it is almost too daring to hope that the people of England, inflamed by missionaries on one side, and imperialist fire-eaters on the other, will still have the good sense and the sagacious firmness to withdraw to Table Mountain, and leave the other states to work out their own destinies. However this may be decided in the discussion that will follow the end of the present troubles with the Zulus, it is meanwhile abundantly clear that there is no resemblance between the case of the Canadian Dominion and the case of the Cape colonists, and that the essential conditions of confederation are at present wholly absent in the latter in every particular. Lord Carnarvon made a great mistake. The South



African Confederation Bill, permissive as it is, is now seen by many who took for granted that what a government proposed must always be at least decently sensible, to be not at all sensible, but a permissive absurdity. Yet it was as a step towards this chimera, that Lord Carnarvon hurried on the annexation which has landed us in the present costly policy of folly and injustice.

There was an attempt to hoodwink the English public by the suggestion that the majority of the Boers welcomed the British flag, and that it was only one or two baffled office-seekers who resented what had been done. The attempt was probably successful, for in the first place, the English public is apt to believe that all the world is privately athirst for the blessings of British rule; and secondly, at that time, as I have said, the English public was immersed in the discharge of its imperial responsibilities in the matter of Batoum, the Lazis, and this or the other sandjak. Mr. Courtney—whose perseverance in trying to arouse the attention of Parliament and the country in the face of much obloquy and profound apathy on his own benches as well as on those opposite, deserves our highest admiration—pointed out in a pregnant speech last August that at least five-sixths of the whole Boer population had protested. The only recognition that he got was a rebuke from the Colonial Secretary for wasting the time of the House! Yet it ought to have interested the House to know how our new subjects liked their new masters. It was a matter, not of sentiment merely, but of business. When Colonel Evelyn Wood left Maritzburg in September last to assume charge of an important district in the Transvaal, he had been informed that eight hundred Dutchmen would come out to assist the troops under his command. "On my arrival, however," he says, "I found that owing to the prevailing feeling of irritation against the Imperial Government, it was generally believed that few or none would come out."<sup>1</sup> So much for the effect of annexation on the Dutch settlers. Its effect on the Zulus was still more mischievous. What is the authority for connecting the annexation of the Transvaal with the present troubles? Why, the distinct statement of the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal. In a despatch which is one of the most important in the whole of these blue-books, Sir Henry Bulwer explains the effect of annexation with a clearness that nobody can mistake, and the passage is too important to be summarised in other words than his own.

"The annexation of the Transvaal has altered, and altered very considerably, our position towards the native races living to the north of Natal. The Dutch Boers who have been the pioneers of European colonization in South Africa were the first to come into contact with these races, and the relations into which we were subsequently brought with the latter, and the position in

---

(1) Blue-book, C. 2222, p. 218.

which we have hitherto stood with regard to them, have, beyond all question, been greatly influenced and coloured by that fact, and by the presence of another and neighbouring European nationality. The natives have not been slow to discriminate between the two nationalities, and to mark the difference in many essential respects between the one Government and the other, and the conclusions drawn by them have, it may be said, been altogether in favour of the English, whose general treatment of them has been milder, more conciliatory, and more just. This state of things has had its advantages. It has served to keep up a sort of political balance, if I may call it so, in this quarter of South Africa, and has enabled the Government of Natal, as the nearest representative of British authority, to exercise a decided influence over the native races in its neighbourhood, an influence which it has used with advantage in preserving for many years the peace of this part of the country. The Zulus, who were in direct and immediate contact with both European nationalities, with the Transvaal Republic on one side, and with the Natal Government on another, were necessarily more nearly affected by the political position than any other native race. The policy of the Zulu King, it has been said, has been to play off the one Government against the other, and to some extent possibly this may have been the case, but, if so, it has certainly been the means of keeping the Zulus, the most powerful and most warlike of all the South African races, with all their military organization and all their capacity to disturb the public peace, quiet during a great number of years. The Zulus soon found out that the English Government had no aggressive designs, that it was contented to keep the boundaries laid down in its treaty with the Zulu nation in 1843, and that it was friendly and moderate in its dealings. They knew it also to be the most powerful Government in South Africa, and they quickly recognised the importance of cultivating its friendship, more particularly in the presence of the neighbouring Republic, of whose policy and designs they did not feel equally sure. The annexation of the Transvaal last year has destroyed the conditions which created the balance to which I have referred. It has substituted one power for two powers, one government for two governments in all this portion of South Africa, and it has brought English authority into direct contact with native races to the north, to whom it was previously known only from a distance. More especially, and more seriously, it has affected our relations with the Zulu King and people, who look with great suspicion upon the new state of things.”<sup>1</sup>

Sir Bartle Frere also might be quoted to show that the present situation is due to annexation, for after the entirely unproven assumption that it had always been the object of Cetuywayo to recover the position which his uncle Chaka held as sovereign in this part of Africa—not an atom of proof of this is before the public—he proceeds to say that “Cetuywayo was angered as well as surprised to find that by the annexation of the Transvaal he was now virtually surrounded by a power even stronger than would have been the combination between his two former neighbours, which it had for years been the main policy of the Zulu rulers to prevent.”<sup>2</sup>

(1) Further correspondence respecting the affairs of South Africa; presented to Parliament, February, 1879, pp. 35-6. There are several other blue-books on the subject, but unless it is stated to be otherwise, the references are to the above.

(2) P. 129.

Now let us grant for the sake of argument that there were reasons of self-preservation which justified the lawlessness of suppressing the little Dutch republic. Let us for the moment concede all the force that has ever been claimed for the position that we could not safely allow the Dutch Government to endanger the security of all the European settlers in the various Cape territories by their disastrous mismanagement of their relations with the natives. Sir Theophilus Shepstone has issued his proclamation; Lord Carnarvon accepts what has been done; the House of Commons discusses the addition of a territory of the size of France, with hardly more serious attention than if it were a bill about a road; Mr. Courtney with vain courage and useless foresight protests alike against the measure and then against the levity with which it is assumed to be necessary and expedient, and in August, 1877, the Transvaal is formally and decisively taken over. What then? Surely we might have expected, inasmuch as the plea for the extinction of the self-government of the Dutch had been the scrape into which they had got themselves with the natives, that we should at once set to work to reverse the policy which had landed the Dutch in their scrape. If our greater success with the natives had arisen from the fact that our treatment of them, in Sir Henry Bulwer's words, had been "milder, more conciliatory, more just," surely it would seem incredible that a circumstance which even in itself and in the first blush had led the Zulu king to look on the new state of things with suspicion, was to be the starting-point of a new policy, less mild, less conciliatory, and, I at least will add, less just. Unfortunately the experience of history shows us that high-handedness in government is the contradictory and natural opposite of policy. The men who have not realised that to abide by equity and to respect the rights of others, do in themselves constitute the surest, as well as the noblest, secret of policy, are not likely, after they have once entered the paths of lawlessness, to find their way back again to the ways of patient prudence. Sir T. Shepstone points a very old tale, and to Sir T. Shepstone was now added a worse spirit than himself. We shall now see what happened after the appearance of Sir Bartle Frere on the scene.

Let us keep in our minds two propositions. First, that we had won our influence over the Zulus by a reputation for being conciliatory and just. Second, that the annexation of the Transvaal, and the circumstances which attended it, were matters by which Cetywayo was still perplexed. He suspected the good faith of the English towards him, and saw in their advance and in all that had taken place the foreshadowing of danger to himself and the Zulu power.<sup>1</sup> Would it not have been the first care of anybody with the

(1) The words of Sir Henry Bulwer, p. 37.

barest tincture of statesmanship in his veins to do his best to appease Cetywayo's perplexity and allay his suspicions? Sir Bartle Frere deliberately set to work to heighten this suspicion, and to show that it was most abundantly justified.

One of the grievances of the Zulus against the Boers of the Transvaal had been encroachments upon certain of their lands. The particular portions in dispute are described as having special value in the eyes of a pastoral people, because spring is there earlier by some weeks, and in a country so scorched by the sun, the land which gets the first spring grass has more than ordinary attractions. The government of the Transvaal Republic—I am now quoting the version of an English official memorandum—or its subjects, with the government's sanction expressed or unexpressed, bent on acquiring a portion of the Zulu country, and, possibly, with the view of ultimately becoming masters of the whole country, pushed the boundaries of the Republic farther and farther into Zululand, disregarding the rights of the Zulu nation, and refusing to listen to their complaints and to the proposals that were made for the dispute coming under the cognisance and judgment of a neutral government. By force of circumstances the subjects of the Transvaal were enabled to hold the lands thus acquired by them for several years. But the Zulus never pretended to acquiesce in this dispossession.<sup>1</sup> On Jan. 25, 1876, Lord Carnarvon had written: "Her Majesty's government cannot accept, or be a party to, any extension of territory by the South African Republic [*i.e.* the Transvaal government], *more especially any appropriation of lands ruled over by Cetywayo.*" "Between the South African Republic, and the Zulus on our northern boundary, a state of excitement, which sometimes causes a good deal of dangerous local irritation, is kept up by the *unsettled question respecting the disputed territory.* This territory was proclaimed last year by the South African Republic as being included within its limits: I believe a large portion of its area was granted as farms by the Transvaal government to its own white subjects, and that some of these farms have been occupied by the grantees in the presence of the prior Zulu occupants, who look upon the land as belonging to their king and repudiate the authority of the Republic." This is Sir T. Shepstone's account on March 30, 1876. What so clear as that the first act of our sovereignty in the Transvaal should have been the restoration of these stolen lands—not merely for equity's sake, but in the interests of pacific relations with our neighbours? It is as clear as the sun at noonday that if the object of the English authorities in taking the Transvaal had been to maintain or strengthen that good character for justice and conciliatoriness which had been standing us in such useful stead for many years, and made our relations with

the Zulus a success, then they would have made haste to restore these disputed lands to the Zulus, even if their title to them had been more doubtful than it was afterwards found to be. Interest would have dictated such a measure, apart from justice. If the new English Administrator had given back the coveted land to Cetywayo and his people, it would have been the surest means of disarming the suspicion with which our movements had been watched. It would have proved to the natives that the new masters of the Transvaal intended to pursue the same course of fair-dealing as the old masters of Natal. Even if Cetywayo's rights had been dubious, that would have been the line of true policy. This politic line was repudiated. We placed ourselves in the position of the government to which we succeeded, and stood forward as heirs to their claims. At length, after a great deal of talk and correspondence, a Commission of Inquiry was appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, to investigate the question of the boundary lands. I need not say that this Commission was entirely composed of Europeans, and that Cetywayo had no friend nor representative upon it. The Commission sent in their report in the middle of last summer, and it was forwarded to Sir Bartle Frere as High Commissioner in the first week of July, 1878. The Commissioners decided—upon the only territorial question between the old Transvaal government and the Zulus, that was known to the Natal government, and that was defined as the object of inquiry—in favour of the Zulu claims. They decided that the evidence brought forward by the Boers of a cession of the lands by the Zulu king was insufficient and fraudulent. Both the High Commissioner and Sir T. Shepstone pressed all the objections that they could think of against the Report, but the Commission rebutted them with a triumphant completeness of which every reader of the blue-book may judge. Nothing could be more clear or more simple. The land was Zulu land, and had been filched from the Zulus by the Dutch. Before proceeding to the amazing, lawless, impolitic, and utterly scandalous award in which Sir Bartle Frere dealt with their verdict, I will give one or two specimens of a Minute which he wrote upon it.

“1. As regards the area the Commissioners propose to divide, I do not gather from any of these papers any precise definition of what may be considered as the basis of the Zulu claims, or of the grounds on which we are to decide whether they ought in equity to have more than they now possess. His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor observes in paragraph 6 of his Despatch of the 8th July, No. 104/S.A., ‘The claims of the Zulus are based upon their original rights to the country, which are not disputed.’ But I cannot find any precise definition or evidence of the sort of right the Zulus may be supposed to possess beyond that of actual possession.

“From the best accounts I can find of them on record they appear to have

been a migratory clan, coming no one can tell exactly whence, but from regions far off the present Zululand, and at no very distant period; moving from one region to another, 'eating up' and conquering the clans with which they came in contact, absorbing their population and cattle, and occupying their grazing grounds, till they became the greatest and most powerful of Kafir clans about the time they came in contact with European Colonists. . . . The European Colonists, on the other hand, were from somewhat different causes also migratory in their habits. They had moved originally from another hemisphere, and had from various reasons travelled or 'trekked' in South Africa till they met the Zulus.

"I confess I fail to find in the recorded history of either people any better claim which either party could advance to the lands they stood on, than that of possession and power to hold and govern; rude title deeds, perhaps, but definite and intelligible, and I can find no other which it seems possible to rely on.

"But much of the talk and writing on the subject of this dispute proceeds on the assumption that either or both parties had or intended to have definite and fixed boundaries and recorded or recognisable legal rights. . . . I can however find nothing of the kind."

There are two answers to all this. The Boers most obviously recognised that the Zulus had once had full right and title to the lands, because they actually rested their own claims to them on an alleged cession by the Zulu king; they were not likely avowedly to derive from him a title to that which was not his to give. But there is even a stronger answer than this. The English, when taking possession of Natal in 1843, entered into a treaty with the Zulu king fixing boundaries within which the disputed territory lies; so that five-and-thirty years ago the English government formally recognised that Zulu title and right, of which the High Commissioner is unable now to find any precise definition or evidence. The definition and evidence of the right, as having existed at least before the alleged cession, are exactly as precise as the right of the British Government to the Isle of Wight.

2. "As far as I can learn there is no authorised form for Zulu cessions of land. How far the single will of the great Chief was sufficient to make a cession valid seems to have depended mainly on the personal character and influence of the Chief, and varied with each individual. As far as I can gather, it would be extremely difficult to find any form of cession which a powerful Chief could not set aside at will, whenever he was so minded, on the ground of alleged informality or non-compliance with some form which he would say was necessary to validity. The power and will of the Chief, not the form or ceremony of the cession, were the points essential to validity and permanence of any grant."

Such an objection as this is the mere cavil of a defeated litigant; even if it were valid so far as it goes, no statesman would regard it as worth pressing. But it is not valid even so far as it goes. The Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, in his despatch replying

to Sir Bartle Frere's Minute, speaks as to this with an authority that is decisive.

"The fact," he says, "of the alleged cessions not having been formally laid before and ratified by the nation at large, is certainly no proof that transactions of some sort may not have taken place between the Zulu King and the Transvaal Republic. But if those transactions were of the nature of a cession of any portion of the Zulu country, they would most assuredly be considered by the nation as invalid because made without its consent. It is quite true that, as your Excellency says, a powerful Chief might take upon himself to act in a manner that was not in conformity with the custom or the usage of his nation, but he would be acting unwisely and at a great risk. In so important a matter as the cession of any portion of the territory of the tribe, the power and will of the King are not, and never would, I believe, be considered sufficient. The will and the voice of the nation as represented by its chief men are held to be essential to such transactions. There may be no absolute law laid down on this subject; but it is apparently according to the usage of the country and according to the usage of the Kafir tribes. In internal matters the King has a large licence to do what he wills, and his will is, in a large degree, the law of the country. But, in the important external relations of the tribes, the relations which affect the tribe as a tribe, the usage of the country requires that the tribe should be consulted through its chief ruler. The despotism of Chaka himself was limited by this necessity."<sup>1</sup>

All this is only worth mentioning, because it illustrates the too common inability to understand that these barbarous peoples, in spite of their barbarism, have a life of their own and a social system of their own, with unwritten laws, usages, and customs, as strong and as binding as ours, constituting a national life less organic than ours, but not any less real or stable. And here let me in passing call attention to a striking inconsistency that is constantly occurring in the history of the relations of civilised nations with the lower races. The men who hold the loose usages and unwritten laws of barbarians in this sovereign and most unscientific contempt, at the same time habitually insist upon exacting from them the most perfect scrupulosity, rigorous punctilio, and close literalness, in every engagement that we have chosen to impose upon them. We recognise neither law nor morality as binding upon us in our dealings with them, yet we will put up with nothing short of the very letter of the law in their dealings with us, under penalty of devastation, annexation, or extermination, as may chance to suit us best. The greater part of Sir Bartle Frere's share in these three blue-books forms one long illustration of that mischievous tendency.

3. Next comes the most astonishing of the criticisms of Sir Bartle Frere's Minute.

"Another question," he says (par. 27), "of vital importance, on which I do not find any clear statement of the Commissioners' views, is what precisely do

the Zulus claim in the disputed territory? What rights do they wish to exercise there? And how do they wish to exercise those rights?"

What rights! Why, the rights, to be sure, which any nation, whether Zulu or English, expects to exercise in territory which has been declared to belong to it; the rights from which it had been, by the finding of our own jury, wrongfully dispossessed; the rights of sovereign ownership. What other rights? Here was a piece of land which in our action of 1843 we recognised as belonging to the Zulus, just as any other part of their territory belonged to them; which the Boers took from them; which the Zulus claimed back; which, as competent persons appointed by our own Governor decided, the Boers had no right to take, and we therefore had no right to keep. Then the High Commissioner asks with audacious simplicity, what kind of rights would they like to exercise there, and how would they like to exercise their rights? It is as though, before paying the award under the Alabama Arbitration, we had insisted on knowing what the Americans would do with the money. Well might Sir Henry Bulwer say:—"I think it is clear that what the Zulus claim in the 'disputed territory' is actual possession and use of the country as Zulu country for the Zulus. Mere sovereignty, with the colonization of the country by European Colonists in any number, they know very well would in a short time come to mean either the sovereignty of the white man or conflict with him. To some few individual traders and storekeepers no doubt the King's permission would be given for residing in the country, but he would scarcely be disposed to extend the permission to any larger number."<sup>1</sup>

The reader will now perhaps be prepared for the piece of lawlessness that followed. The encroachments on the land had been a bitter and just grievance of the Zulus for years; the Natal government had offered to arbitrate between the Zulus and the Boers on the subject; when we inherited the quarrel, policy pointed to its instant restoration; but at least we had the grace to consent to an inquiry in a matter which we had ourselves admitted to be proper for arbitration: Cetwayo and his people were eagerly awaiting the judgment of the Commissioners; that judgment, as it had happened, had gone in the direction in which policy and our own interest in conciliatory courses would have had it go; and nothing now remained but for the High Commissioner to issue his award accordingly. The High Commissioner did issue his award, and it was this. The wrongful possessors were to be confirmed in their wrongful possession, and a British Resident was to be placed in Zululand, to take care that they were free to do as they chose in lands in which, as the same award admitted, they had no right to be. Here are the words in which

(1) C. p. 35.



Sir Bartle Frere states his proposals in his despatch to the Colonial Secretary in London (Nov. 16, 1878):—

“1. That as regards territorial jurisdiction the verdict of the Boundary Commissioners be accepted unaltered: portions of the district between the Pongolo and the Buffalo Rivers, as defined by the Commissioners, being declared to belong to the Zulu nation and the Transvaal respectively.

“2. That the limits of these respective portions be at once surveyed and demarcated by a mixed Commission.

“3. That measures be taken at the same time to inquire into, define, and secure the private rights of property which have grown up in both portions of the divided territory during the years when the right of territorial sovereignty has been in dispute.

“4. That inasmuch as the existing system of government in Zululand makes no provision for securing any rights of person or of private property, that such rights in the portion of the disputed territory assigned to Zulus be placed specially under the charge of the British Resident, who on other grounds will be appointed to represent British interests in Zululand, and to secure performance of those promises of better administration which were made by Cetuywayo to the British Government and the Zulu nation, at the time of his coronation and recognition as King by the British Government.”

In other words, the lands were to belong to the Zulus, but the people to whom they did not belong were to retain them; and a British Resident was to keep watch and ward lest the wrongful possessors should suffer molestation from the lawful owners. Colonists in London—without producing a word of evidence, by the way—try to draw us off the true issues by hinting that it was Cetuywayo who stirred up Sicokeni against us, and so forth. That has in any case nothing to do with the award. The award rests on its own merits. It is a separate and independent transaction, and I defy any honest and impartial man to read through the papers that record that transaction without coming to the conviction that Sir Bartle Frere's course was a piece of nefarious lawlessness.

There are worse things to follow, for we now come to the communication of this unrighteous award, and to the ultimatum which preceded the actual outbreak of hostilities. The fact is plain from Sir Bartle Frere's earlier despatches, that he had made up his mind that war against the Zulus was inevitable. He sanctioned the appointment of the Commission of Inquiry because its proceedings would cause delay, and allow time for the arrival of the reinforcements which he was beseeching the home government by every mail to send out. He believed Sir T. Shepstone's assurance that the land which the Boers had stolen really belonged to them “by evidence the most incontrovertible, overwhelming, and clear.”<sup>1</sup> And then when to his amazement the Commission decided that the evidence

(1) Blue-book, C. 2079, p. 54.

was incontrovertibly, overwhelmingly, and clearly the other way, he shifted the ground, and declared that Cetywayo's misgovernment was incompatible with our self-preservation.

Such a settlement of the boundary question was in itself likely to provoke a war, as Sir Bartle Frere well knew. He had been warned that the boundary question was the greatest cause of danger; that it was "of the highest importance that we should put ourselves right in this matter;" and that at any rate by dealing with that dispute on its merits, we should put ourselves so far in the right, and that by doing this we should not be "prejudicing our position or our prestige in our future relations with the Zulus."<sup>1</sup> The importance not only of the right decision on the boundary question being formed, but of its being communicated to Cetywayo as soon as possible, was fully recognised by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and was impressed by him on the High Commissioner. Cetywayo's complaint, he says with sufficient emphasis in his despatch of Nov. 21, 1878:—

"That the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal 'is hiding from him the answer that has come from across the sea about the land boundary question, and is only making an excuse for taking time so as to surprise him,' *is not altogether an unnatural one for a native chief situated in his circumstances*, who is necessarily ignorant of much that has passed on this subject, and of many of the causes to which the delay is attributable. But it is a misunderstanding which it should be the earnest endeavour of the Government to remove, and I am confident that there is no need to impress upon you the importance of losing no time in dealing with this question, or the beneficial effect which its satisfactory settlement may be expected to have upon the strained relations which you describe as now existing between the Colony of Natal and the Zulu nation."<sup>2</sup>

The High Commissioner, in defiance of such views as these, made an award which was the least satisfactory that could have been made; he intensified the irritation of those whom it was his business to conciliate, by delay in announcing the settlement; and he finally wound up the announcement with the most provoking demands that he could possibly have invented. The award meant, and could only have been intended to mean, war; and therefore it is not surprising that Sir Bartle Frere resolved to accompany its announcement to Cetywayo with an ultimatum on other matters, which he and everybody else well knew that Cetywayo would reject.

Why are we at war with Cetywayo, and what are the reasons why, in Sir Bartle Frere's judgment, the English nation ought to be willing to expend thousands of lives and millions of money? This is a plain question which every citizen and taxpayer is bound to ask himself, and which deserves a plain answer. That answer is to be found in the Memorandum of Terms to be proposed to Cetywayo,

(1) Sir H. Bulwer, p. 37.

(2) South Africa Correspondence presented December 6, 1878, p. 332.

signed by Sir Bartle Frère, and dated November 13, 1878.<sup>1</sup> The pith of the document lies in paragraphs 22—5 :—

“ 22. It is the duty of the British Government not only to look to the safety of its own Colonies, but having taken part with the Zulu nation in placing Cetywayo on the throne, now to assist the Zulus in securing that he shall perform the promises he made at his coronation.

“ But no such security can be effectual as long as Cetywayo keeps up his present military establishment.

“ All the youth and manhood of the country are taken as soldiers ; kept from marrying and from earning their bread, according to the caprice of Cetywayo ; compelled to execute his orders, to kill and plunder without trial or warning ; and are thus cruelly oppressed themselves and made instruments for oppressing all Zulus.

“ This is grievous tyranny in breach of the promises which were a part of Cetywayo's compact with his people when he was put on the throne, and with the British Government when the representatives of that Government recognised him.

“ 23. The first thing, therefore, to be required of Cetywayo is, that as a step towards the performance of his coronation promises he shall give up his present military system, and adopt such military regulations as may be decided on after consultation with the Great Council of the Zulus and with the representatives of the British Government.

“ 24. It cannot be said that Cetywayo is an independent sovereign, and that the British Government has no right to interfere with the internal administration of Zululand.

“ 25. Zululand is surrounded landward by the territory of the British Government or its allies. They are all peaceful, non-aggressive people, and would never interfere with Cetywayo, nor attempt to harm him or his subjects, unless Cetywayo first meddled with them, but whilst he keeps up a large standing army, useless for all but purposes of tyranny or aggression, it is quite impossible for his peaceful neighbours to feel secure. The English Government is forced to keep large numbers of Her Majesty's troops in Natal and the Transvaal, and even then the people do not feel secure that Cetywayo will not attack them to ‘ wash his spears.’

“ It is, therefore, absolutely necessary for the peace and quiet of Natal or the Transvaal, that Cetywayo should alter his military system, and reduce his army to such dimensions as shall be considered by the Great Council of the Zulus and the British Government sufficient to secure the internal peace of the country.”

It seems to be accepted in a rough way that this, then, is the reason why we are at war with the King of the Zulus, namely that he keeps on foot a large standing army. But the standing army is no novelty. On the 11th of December, 1878, fourteen Zulu deputies came to hear the award, and when the ultimatum was presented, they said on this point, that

"They did not understand the reason for the disbandment of the Zulu army; that from the time of Cetywayo's great grandfather there had been a Zulu army, and that it was in accordance with the law and custom of the Zulus to enrol the young men as soldiers; the Zulus had their army, as the English had theirs" (p. 217).

Cetywayo's rule is not fresh. It is true that he was only installed in 1873, but we have it on Sir T. Shepstone's own authority that "practically the government of Zululand had been in the hands of Cetywayo since 1856: political circumstances and the failing health of his father rendered this inevitable."<sup>1</sup> Yet during all these two-and-twenty years, and with the same great standing army as that which disturbs us now, the disposition on both sides—again on Sir T. Shepstone's authority—"was to secure a peaceful solution of any difficulties which might arise." What, again, does Sir Henry Bulwer say, the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, and no sentimental philanthropist? "The maintenance of a standing and well-organized army is according to the custom of the Zulu nation, which in all its traditions and instincts is warlike, and *does not in itself prove that there is any set purpose of aggression in the mind of the King.*"

It is true that in another place the Lieutenant-Governor says:—

"The course of events during the last two years [otherwise, less periphrastically, the annexation of the Transvaal] has so altered the position of British authority in South Africa, it has so multiplied our responsibility, and the political and the military situations have become such, that the relations of the Zulu Government with us, and the condition of the Zulu country, can no longer with safety be left as they are. It has now become a matter of positive necessity to do something."

Granting this, there is assuredly no spark of evidence in any paper now before the public, that there was any necessity for insisting on Cetywayo complying with our demands and agreeing to revolutionise the whole system of his government "within 15 days" (p. 95); and this precipitation, iniquitous as it was morally, and imprudent as it was politically, was still more fatuous militarily, for the High Commissioner knew that we had not the forces to make victory certain. One quotation will illustrate the High Commissioner's precipitancy. Writing to Sir. M. Hicks-Beach on October 28, 1878, he says:—

"His Excellency Lieutenant-General Thesiger has returned from a fortnight's inspection of the frontier posts and lines of communication, which has enabled him to confirm his views in some respects, and to modify them in others, but has in no way, I am assured, affected his estimate of the extreme gravity of the situation, or of the necessity for the reinforcements already applied for."<sup>2</sup>

(1) Report of Cetywayo's Installation, p. 7.

(2) South Africa Correspondence, C. 2220, p. 352.

But if this were so, what criminal infatuation to launch an award and an ultimatum, which were sure to bring the grave situation to a crisis, and to plunge us instantly into a military position with which, as reinforcements were *necessary*, we should be admittedly unable to cope. And in this precipitancy, Sir Bartle Frere sinned against light. So far as we have any reason to know, Sir Henry Bulwer possesses at least as full a knowledge of all that is going on, openly or clandestinely, as Sir Bartle Frere possesses. Sir Henry Bulwer's advice is directly opposed to the rash courses of his chief. The following passage deserves to be read and re-read and read again :—

"In any case," he says, "it would be well to proceed with caution. . . . It is a question if it is well to give any decision amounting to an ultimatum at once, and without previous communications on the subject. The message would be a preliminary step towards a decision, and it is, I think, a preliminary step which it is advisable to take, because it is of importance that the Zulu nation should know what is the question at issue between us and the Zulu King, and should have time to understand and comprehend that the question is one which concerns their interests and their welfare, and a question which is being taken up by us on their behalf. At this moment, so far as the Zulu nation knows, the principal question at issue is the boundary question; and, if we were to say now, at once, and without giving time for the matter to be thoroughly understood, that we had decided upon such and such a punishment for the King, or upon such a course, there would be a great risk of the question at issue between us being misunderstood by the people at large. It is desirable, I think, that it should first be made known throughout Zululand as far and as fully as possible, and that it should be understood by the people that the question of the disputed boundary has been settled, and that what was held to be Zulu country has been given to the Zulus; and then it can be made known that there is another question between us, but that it is a question which is rather between us and the King than between us and the nation, and that it is one in which we have taken up the cause of the people; and if the people be got thoroughly to understand this, it will probably make the solution of the Zulu question far easier than it otherwise will be."

In the face of these wise counsels, Sir Bartle Frere writes :—"We have reason to hope that the messages to be given will on the whole be acceptable to a majority of the Zulu nation, when understood" (p. 97). Very acceptable on the whole, when the Zulu nation fully understood that the boundary lands were theirs, but on condition that they were never to pasture their cattle in them, nor build kraals in them, nor in any way act otherwise than as if the lands belonged to somebody else; next, when they understood that a British Resident was to be set up over their own King; and finally when they remembered that it is the fashion of the English, whenever they acquired a foothold among natives, to exact a hut-tax. Who can doubt that Sir Henry Bulwer was right when he wrote to the High Commissioner as far back as September last, that the Zulu people

shared to the full the apprehensions and suspicions of the Zulu King?

"The nation at large is ill at ease as to what our intentions are, and alienated as are the sympathies of his people from him, gladly as they would welcome relief from his personal rule, and readily as, it is believed, a large portion of the nation would accept English protection and the establishment of a just rule amongst them, they are not prepared to accept the invasion and loss of their country without fighting for it. The defence of Zulu soil would in fact, it is thought, be made a common cause, and rally the whole of the Zulu nation round the King."

"The Zulu nation," says Sir Bartle Frere, "have certainly a right to demand that the promises so seriously made, so solemnly proclaimed, and so gladly welcomed by them on the day of Cetywayo's installation shall be kept" (p. 33). As if the boundary decision had not put into Cetywayo's hands the most powerful weapon that could have been devised. These people, he will say, who complain of me for breaking promises, have set aside the verdict of their own judges; they have stolen your lands; they are going to send you a master; they will make you pay a hut-tax. It was impossible that Sir Bartle Frere could have gone more surely to work if his object had been to alienate those whom he pretended to wish to persuade that he was their deliverer.

Let us now pass to another class of pretexts for the war; the alleged defiance of the English government by the Zulu king. Many of the stories as to Cetywayo's menacing attitude appear to be the invention of newspaper editors, reflecting the panic of some colonists and the bad faith of others. There was no defiance or hint of disturbance since the interview with Sir T. Shepstone at the Blood River. There were alarming and prolonged rumours about a great military kraal which Cetywayo was alleged to have built near the Transvaal frontier; but the great military kraal in due time dwindled down to an ordinary kraal built by the headman for his own use. The writers who "cannot doubt" that Cetywayo was at the bottom of the action of Sicokeni, and is at the back of Kreli, produce simply not one atom of even the very faintest evidence. It is not absolutely impossible; *argal*, it is probable; *argal*, it is quite certain and cannot be doubted. If there be this alliance between Sicokeni and Cetywayo, and there is known to be friendship between them, the impolicy of our provocation to the Zulu king is more flagrant than ever, for nothing is more likely than the trouble of his friend to bring Sicokeni—against whom we have hitherto failed—into the Transvaal, by way of creating a diversion in Cetywayo's favour. Cetywayo had undoubtedly been rendered uneasy at the military preparations which had been going on for some months in Natal. When he saw

his whole border from the mouth of the Tugela River to Luneberg lined with our forces, what more natural than that he should bring a contingent of his own people down to his South-west frontier?

We are left equally in the dark as to the authority on which habitual and promiscuous massacres of his own people are charged against Cetywayo. No such evidence is to be found in the papers laid before Parliament, nor in the colonial newspapers. And we do know that certain charges made against Cetywayo are merely distorted exaggerations of simple and harmless facts. Some facts are not harmless, but their magnitude has been misrepresented. Cetywayo gave an order for two of his regiments to marry regiments of girls of a certain age. The girls refused, and some of them and of their friends were put to death. A European officer says that "*several* were killed," and a messenger of our government returning from Zululand reports: "We heard that the King was causing some of the Zulus to be killed, on account of disobeying his orders respecting the marriage of girls." Cetywayo, when remonstrated with by the English government, said in effect that he had no gaols, and that he must govern his people as he best could, according to Zulu use and wont. And all this was two years ago, before a word had been said about Cetywayo's defiant action. In any case, does any serious politician contend that it is our business, overburdened as we are and staggering under the load of our responsibilities, to go into a costly war whenever we find a cruel custom on our borders?

I will now pass to two other transactions which have been so monstrously distorted, magnified, and generalised, as to have so impressed the mind of the British electors—if we may judge from the "heckling" of a Scotch candidate last week—that they actually believe Cetywayo to be incessantly harassing our border, devastating territory, and carrying off our cattle and women.

The reader may judge for himself what is meant by a raid upon English territory, from the instance of the two men who went, if we may put it bluntly, to do the work of spies on the Zulu border. The following is Sir Henry Bulwer's account of the transaction, with his judgment upon it:—

"I think the visit paid by Mr. Smith with his companion to the Middle Drift, for the purpose of inspecting the drift, was a step much to be regretted and condemned. The Zulus have always looked upon the new road which was lately made to that drift with very great mistrust of its object. They have suspected, quite wrongly, that we had some design against them in making it, and they have objected to the use of the drift for waggon purposes, and in point of fact it has never been used for these purposes. The time chosen by those who sent Mr. Smith to inspect the drift was a time when the Zulu mind was *greatly excited, and not altogether without cause, by the reports which reached them that a great number of troops had arrived in Natal, that these troops had come with*

*the intention of invading Zululand*, and that such was the talk everywhere in Natal both on the part of soldiers and colonists. In consequence of a large gathering which took place in Zululand, and which no doubt originated in the uneasiness created by the reports from Natal, it became necessary to send troops to Greytown. This town lies in the direction of the Middle Drift, and the movement confirmed the fears of the Zulus. Moreover, one or two officers, it was known, had been down to that unused drift, to inspect it and other drifts leading into the Zulu country. It was at this moment that Mr. Smith was sent, without my orders or sanction, to inspect both the roads and the drift *for military purposes*. The Zulu people living on the other side could only look on the act from one point of view. What took place on that occasion is described by Mr. Smith. He says that the river bed is very wide, and is formed by a number of sandbanks fringed with bush and channels running between. On account of the drought all the channels were dry, with the exception of one which lay close into the Zulu side. Mr. Smith walked across the river bed until he came to this channel, making his observations and taking notes of what work would be necessary to make the drift passable for waggons. He did not cross the last channel, nor did he cross any water at all, because the channels that he crossed were dry. As he was making his observations, a number of Zulus came down; they were very excited, surrounded him and his companion, caught hold of him and made him sit down, and asked him what he was doing there on Zulu ground. They gradually became more quiet, and, after detaining Mr. Smith and his companion for an hour and a half or two hours, they let them go. They made no attempt, says Mr. Smith, to take anything forcibly from him, though in a pilfering manner they helped themselves to some small articles of little value (a box of matches, some tobacco, and a pocket-handkerchief) from his pocket. One of them asked Mr. Smith also to give him a pipe, which he did. Mr. Smith and his companion appear to have behaved with calmness and temper on the occasion. I am bound to say that I think the proceeding was, under the circumstances, a very injudicious one, and almost amounted to a culpable provocation on our part which must in some degree extenuate the offence of the Zulus. At the same time the latter had, of course, no right to act as they did, and an apology for the act, together with a small fine to mark the offence, may very properly be demanded" (p. 173).

One need not have had dealings with barbarians to recognise that this is the language of sobriety, moderation, good sense, and right feeling. We are therefore not at all surprised to find that Sir Bartle Frere cannot concur in the lenient views of his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor.

"Mr. Smith," replies Sir Bartle Frere, "was beyond a doubt on the Natal side of the water; to seize him, to carry him across the water, to take from him any small articles he had on his person, to detain him for an hour-and-a-half, and to threaten his life, whether done by the King's order or only by his border guards, and subsequently only tacitly approved by his not punishing the offenders, seems to me a most serious insult and outrage, and should be severely noticed" (p. 176).

It will hardly be believed that in one of his gloomy despatches to



Sir M. Hicks-Beach, deploring the "precarious prospect of preserving peace much longer," Sir Bartle Frere actually vindicates his forebodings by this trumpety affair. He admits the indiscretion of his countrymen, but "it is evident," he says sorrowfully, "that it is but a precarious state of peace which is liable to be broken as a consequence of such an indiscretion."<sup>1</sup> This is one of the matters for which we are now at war. It is the rape of Mr. Smith's pipe and pocket-handkerchief, that we are now avenging with carnage and ruin.

The next raid is more serious. Sirayo is one of the great men of Cetywayo's country. Two of Sirayo's wives ran away; one version is that they were tired of Sirayo, and eloped with two men; another that Sirayo had been ill, and that his illness was due to some evil bewitchment wrought upon him by the acts of these women. The unfortunate women at different times and places escaped over the Buffalo River into the territory of Natal. By-and-by (July, 1878) two of Sirayo's sons gathered parties of their people together, passed over to the soil of Natal, and seized the women in the kraals of natives with whom they had taken refuge. Without doing the slightest injury to any white or black resident of the colony, they carried the women back to their own land, and there dealt with them as the French dramatist the other day urged that all such offenders should be dealt with: they slew them.<sup>2</sup> Now this violent and riotous action of two hot-headed youths was undoubtedly an offence for which the Lieutenant-Governor was justified in exacting reparation, but it was no raid against European settlers or English subjects.

Cetywayo, on receiving Sir H. Bulwer's remonstrance and demands, sent an explanation,<sup>3</sup> an apology, and fifty pounds. The money was sent back, with a request for the surrender of the young men. Cetywayo is not so absolute as it has suited some of our officials to represent. It is no easy thing for him to give up the sons of one of his great barons; and it was at least not a thing to be done without the sanction of the great council of the nation.

"The views of the nation," says Sir H. Bulwer, "we are not yet in possession of. There are only two ways by which, so far as I can see, due reparation for this offence can be made, namely, either by the surrender of those who committed the outrage or the ringleaders, which secures the *personal* punishment of the offenders, or else by the payment of a fine by the King and nation so heavy as to be a punishment on the *nation*, and a sufficient guarantee and security against the commission of similar offences in future. I should, myself, be disposed to accept either, because either will, I think, meet the object we have in view; and, if the nation elects that the punishment shall fall upon

(1) C. 2220, p. 305.

(2) C. 2220, pp. 195—8

3) See C. 2220, p. 266, for Cetywayo's message, August 24, 1878.

itself instead of upon the persons of the individual offenders, it may be said that it has a right so to elect, but the penalty should be made a heavy one."

While the matter was under consideration, our military preparations in Natal were proceeding and causing the liveliest excitement and alarm in Zululand. Cetywayo sent down to know what it all meant, and what he had done. Is it a thing to be wondered at that he delayed the surrender of the two young men, when he saw how much reason there was to believe that neither that nor anything else could avert the war?

These are examples of the pretexts on which this war has been begun, and has been begun as if there were not a moment to lose. We read page after page of these books in search of some shadow of a reason for instant action. The search is vain. And Sir M. Hicks-Beach felt it to be vain. It is not to be forgotten that this decisive action was taken without the knowledge or sanction of the home authorities. We have been plunged into a costly war without the consent of our own government, and in the face of warnings from the Secretary of State that such consent would not very readily be given. The Secretary for the Colonies might well write:—

"I may observe that the communications which had previously been received from you had not entirely prepared them for the course which you have deemed it necessary to take. The representations of Lord Chelmsford and yourself last autumn as to the urgent need of strengthening Her Majesty's forces in South Africa were based upon the imminent danger of an invasion of Natal by the Zulus, and the inadequate means at that time at your disposal for meeting it. In order to afford protection to the lives and property of the colonists, the reinforcements asked for were supplied, and in informing you of the decision of Her Majesty's Government, I took the opportunity of impressing upon you the importance of using every effort to avoid war. But the terms which you have dictated to the Zulu King, however necessary to relieve the Colony in future from an impending and increasing danger, are evidently such as he may not improbably refuse, even at the risk of war; and I regret that the necessity for immediate action should have appeared to you so imperative as to preclude you from incurring the delay which would have been involved in consulting Her Majesty's Government upon a subject of so much importance as the terms which Cetywayo should be required to accept before those terms were actually presented to the Zulu King."<sup>1</sup>

Apart from the inconceivable impolicy of the way in which the resolution to break up Cetywayo's army was first rashly carried into execution, against the advice of competent counsellors on the spot, and without the sanction and to the great surprise of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach at home, let us consider the general maxims by which Sir Bartle Frere defends—not his precipitancy, for there is no ostensible defence of that—but the imperious substance of his ulti-

(1) January 23, 1879, p. 198.

matum. There is, let me say to begin with, a contention that, at Cetywayo's installation as King of the Zulus in 1873, the English agent who was present was there as the representative of the suzerainty of England, and that therefore the promises made on that occasion were made not only to the Zulu nation, but to the British government. The Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, after examining the papers relative to the proceedings on the occasion, confesses himself struck with the defectiveness of the proof of such a position as is now assumed, having been sufficiently declared, accepted, and sustained: he thinks that the contention of the assertion of our suzerainty could be as strongly denied as maintained.<sup>1</sup> But the point is not important, except as exemplifying the recklessness with which Sir Bartle Frere takes for granted all that makes in favour of the sovereign right of the English government to do as they please. The special point need not be laboured, because the High Commissioner says:—

"It is clear to my mind that our right to interfere with his proceedings rests on a different, and I think a higher ground than that of any prescriptive dependence of the Zulu sovereign on us. It is simply our own right of self-preservation. I would not for an instant question our responsibility for putting an end to a system which locks up all the manhood of the country in a compulsory celibacy, considered by the despot necessary to the efficiency of his army, a system which destroys all private property and industry, which forbids all improvement by civilisation or education, and relies solely on a regular course of murder and plunder by armed bands of the King's soldiers for the replenishment of the royal exchequer. I will not attempt to measure our national guilt, or innocence, for allowing such a state of things to continue under a virtual, if not avowed protection, supplying the despot with arms to keep his people down, and preventing all natural remedies by foreign conquest as well as by internal resistance to his tyranny. But our right to interfere with him, and compel him to govern as well as a good and peaceable native ruler can govern, rests on the first law of nature, the instinct of self-preservation" (p. 129).

Now some people would maintain that, if it were proved that war with the Zulus were essential to the preservation of the European settlements, even then war would not be justifiable. But that extreme doctrine is not wanted here. We may accept the High Commissioner's premise, and still reject his conclusions. We have preserved ourselves for nearly a quarter of a century with Cetywayo and his army on our borders, and how? By moderation, prudence, goodwill, and justice. Sir Bartle Frere, like all men of the bad and incompetent school to which he belongs, holds that you can only be safe by war. These opinions, which have now at last been banished from our dealings with European nations, flourish in all their baleful

(1) P. 169. See also Sir M. Hicks-Beach to the same effect, p. 115.

vigour in our dealings with inferior races. What we insist—and the proposition is not an arbitrary and *à priori* proposition, but is supported by some of the best evidence from colonial administrators—is that it is exactly in your dealings with inferior races that you ought most sedulously to follow the same spirit which has gradually banished violence, harshness, and cruel repression from the conduct of the young, from the treatment of the insane, and from the punishment of criminals, and has substituted in the place of those dark processes a rational moderation and enlightened humanity, the force of lenient and considerate example, and calm self-possession. In vain do we search these blue-books for one single proof or reasonable presumption that anything had happened to change the old relations between ourselves and the Zulus, except the change that had come over the spirit of our administration, the change from equity and conciliatoriness, to fraud and violence.

Policy, however, in the hands of men like Sir T. Shepstone and Sir Bartle Frere, does not change without a reason, and the reason here is tolerably clear after due consideration. “Our intercourse with the Zulus,” wrote Sir T. Shepstone (Nov. 15, 1875), “is regulated by a sort of tacit understanding, which has grown out of our relative positions and the circumstances which from time to time have arisen out of them. This intercourse is in the nature of things frequent and intimate, and has been so ever since the establishment of Natal as a British colony thirty years ago, and it has been effectual in maintaining peace and good-will between this Government and the Zulus.” This scene of peace and good-will has been transformed to the ruin of war, simply because Cetywayo asserted a claim which proves to be just, but which it did not please Sir T. Shepstone, for reasons which are tolerably plain, to admit.

Two things are at the bottom of the change. The first is the necessity under which Sir T. Shepstone laboured of justifying his annexation of the Transvaal; justifying it, I mean, to the Boers who, as has been shown, cherish the bitterest resentment against the suppressor of their government. The Administrator naturally thinks that if he can triumphantly carry out the policy of encroachment which the Boers failed in maintaining for themselves, and if he can set his heel on the neck of their enemies, then they will begin cheerfully to acquiesce in the new rule, and to admit that the Administrator's policy was right. Sir Bartle Frere has been inoculated with this idea. There is a casual paragraph in one of Sir Bartle Frere's despatches to the Secretary of State, which explicitly admits the importance that he attaches to the effect of a triumph over the Zulus upon the Boers. The Boers, he says—

“The Boers, like the natives, are now watching what we do in our discussions with the Zulus. If they see that we are able to do what they them-

selves could not effect, by keeping the Zulus in check, the Boers will acquiesce, with more or less equanimity, in the justice of our annexation of the Transvaal. Otherwise they will consider that this, at least for the grounds we assigned, is invalid; and even if they abstain from resistance to authority, they will submit with a bitter and not ill-founded sense of the insufficiency of our justification."<sup>1</sup>

That is Sir T. Shepstone's secret; a crime is to cover a blunder. The Zulus are to be sacrificed to please the Boers. He made a mistake in annexing the Transvaal, and next, by way of making the best of his mistake, he leads the High Commissioner to a policy which will end in the wanton destruction of thousands of lives, in the expenditure of some millions of the money of the English people, and in a legacy of inextricable confusion.

The second element is Sir Frere's belief in the mission of England as a great civilising power. I believe in England's civilising power too, but only on condition that every maxim which Sir Bartle Frere's school think capital, shall be finally condemned by English opinion as infamous. His despatches abound in phrases of edification about our obligations as a civilised and Christian government, about our national guilt in sanctioning elements antagonistic to civilisation and Christianity, and so forth. When I come across such phrases in a blue-book, I shudder; they always precede a massacre. They meant here that we were putting arms into the hands of the most ferocious tribes that we could find to take our side; that gunpowder waggons with their red flags were obstructing the roads of Natal; that we had got a Gatling gun, particularly recommended for dealing death to massed groups, and warranted to turn Zulus into carrion at the rate of so many discharges per second.

One of Sir Bartle Frere's despatches to Sir M. Hicks-Beach encloses extracts from a sermon then lately preached in Trinity Church, Grahamstown. He does not agree with all the views expressed, but he recommends them to attention as "the outspoken opinions of a thoughtful religious man."<sup>2</sup> It is a matter for regret that the views of the thoughtful religious man cannot be set forth here in all their length, but a few samples will serve to show the tenour of his discourse.

"It is needful to remember that we are in this country as Colonists. This is not our fatherland. This land formerly belonged to barbarians. These farms which we sell and purchase, these pasture fields where we graze our cattle, these acres which we plough and sow, these craven upon which we build our houses and plant our orchards, these forests where we gather our timber—all belonged to these Kafir tribes. *We came, we saw, we conquered*, so that now we are the possessors of the soil. Sometimes we forget this. Because we

(1) December 10, 1878. C. 2222, p. 185.

(2) June 1, 1878. C. 2144, p. 221.

consider ourselves to be a superior race, because we profess to be civilisers, we think that we have a better right to this country than its original occupants. We can develop its resources! We can improve its productiveness! We can make it contribute to our wealth! Better far, we say, that we should keep a firm hold of it than that it should be in possession of a degraded and barbarous race. Seeing, then, that this is the case, is it not natural, is it not human, that these people should have no affection for us, that they should not cherish any deep-rooted loyalty, but that they should ever be on the watch for an opportunity to recover their lost country? The marvel rather is that they have been so peaceful and tractable, and willing to serve us, and that they have not long ago combined to make an effort to recover their lost territory. Observe, however, that I do not argue that we have no right to be here. I do not affirm that we should never have set foot on South African soil. I do not contend that we should not have deprived the Kafir of the country where his forefathers lived. I wish you simply to remember this fact, that we are now living and working and enriching ourselves on a soil towards which the native looks with a wistful eye. I believe that the Lord 'hath delivered it into our hands,' but then the question arises, have there not been with us, even with ourselves, sins against the Lord our God? . . . .

"Now, I have all along maintained, and I maintain it still, that this Gaika tribe, who are our more immediate neighbours, is the key to the whole Native Question. Had we acted wisely towards them, had we been able to exercise authority over them, had we taught them that they are our subjects, as well as showed them the equity of our laws, then the other tribes whom we are hastily annexing would have seen that the British Government is the best, the wisest, and the most just on the face of God's earth. We had it in our power by our rule over Sandilli and his people to show what stuff we were made of; we had the opportunity given to us of instructing other tribes through them as to the system of our rule. Instead of that, what did we do? We simply allowed these Gaikas to live and act as they pleased. . . . The chiefs strove to the very utmost of their ability to point out to their people that their rule is better than ours, and that their national customs must be observed. *We adjudicated on cases of polygamy; we polluted our courts by listening to and deciding upon questionable acts; we did not see to it that the day of rest was observed; we sent our native police to arrest prisoners, and exact fines, and listen to law-suits on this day of rest. Is there not in all this sin against the Lord our God?* . . . .

"God has been very gracious to us; He has allowed us to enjoy well-nigh 30 years of peace, and now before the plot of combination which has been spoken of was ripe, has caused it to burst, and why? In order, I firmly believe, that we might have our sins of misrule unmasked to us, in order that they may be brought prominently into view. Let us thank God for His mercy, for His forbearance in having saved us from a widespread war, but whilst we are thankful let us also humble ourselves, for we have great reason to do so. Now is a crisis in our history. Did time permit I would point out to you several golden opportunities in the past which God gave us to solve the native question, so far as our immediate neighbours are concerned, but which we allowed to pass unimproved, and we have suffered for it. We are now favoured with another. . . . .

"Let us see to it that defensive measures are adopted, and that we are

prepared, if need be, by a resort to arms, to enforce any measure which has the welfare of these tribes as its chief object. If this scourge of war leads to the study of the native question, and to the adoption of a sound, vigorous, and righteous native policy, then the Lord hath dealt very graciously with us, for He has reminded us of our sins before it is too late, and because we have thus humbled ourselves He has shown mercy, and given us a fresh opportunity to correct our faults and shortcomings. . . . .”<sup>1</sup>

“No, my young friend,” said Mr. Chadband, “I will not let you alone. And why? Because I am a harvest labourer, because I am a toiler and a moiler, because you are delivered over unto me, and are become as a precious instrument in my hands.” Has it never occurred to this thoughtful religious man, to this impious and sanguinary fanatic, who thus takes the name of the Lord his God in vain, adding the fuel of theological bigotry to the flames of colonial avarice, cupidity and race-hatred, that the same Zulu who hit upon the difficulties of the Old Testament, may be acute enough to see that to talk of the scourge of war as a sweet opportunity and gracious mercy of the Lord, is blasphemously to violate both the letter and the spirit of the New Testament? We may read how Andreas Pretorius, the first President of the Transvaal Republic, nourished himself every day on a chapter in the book of Deuteronomy, in which the chosen race is bidden to make the people of every city tributaries to them, and should the people of that city refuse, then—“when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword—thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth.” In taking over the Transvaal, then, are we to inherit the ferocious spirit of its founder? What is the difference between Sir Bartle Frere’s thoughtful religious man, and the monks who incited Cortes and his conquistadores to light the fires of the Inquisition among the unfortunate natives of South America? It would only be too easy, for alas, the satire is as old as Christianity, to mock at the priests of the creed of brotherly love and meekness and charity, ‘wading through slaughter to a’ pulpit, to preach how blessed are the peacemakers. But the spirit of mockery dies away in us, in shame and humiliation that we, whose fathers could take no rest until they had cleared the name of their land from the stain of cruelty and injustice to the negro slave, are now once more embarking on that very course of policy towards a lower race which from our childhood upwards we have all been taught to abhor in the Spanish and Portuguese tyrants of the sixteenth century, and which strewed a hemisphere with such states as Mexico, drifting and festering like a leviathan wreck on the tideless heavy waters of that worst barbarism which comes of the corruption of civilisation.

Meanwhile, there is some good evidence on the subject of South

(1) C. 2144, p. 225, &c.

African missionaries, which I should like to quote. A Special Commissioner, of great experience in dealing with inferior races, was sent out to the Orange River Territory by the Duke of Newcastle five-and-twenty years ago. Sir George Clerk's despatches on the whole subject of our position in South Africa are full of interest, and what he says of missionaries is this:—"Instead of the humble missionary going first, trusting to his pious life, and to the example of his simple disinterested conversions, entirely divested of secular views, it has too often happened not only that a trafficking mercantile undertaking has, as a means of support, been projected by him," but he cajoles out of the chiefs large grants of land, which are paraded as evidence of the strength and prosperity of the sect that he represents. I have no space for Sir George Clerk's illustration of the insolence of these men towards the representatives of the English Government. But the protest with which he leaves the matter is so relevant to the present situation, as to deserve quotation:—"Another unfortunate circumstance," he says, "I consider to be that the introduction of religious guides and teachers among the native tribes in South Africa generally has been accompanied by a flourish of Government patronage and declaration, or printed proclamation of a Governor's desire and intention to promote religion, humanity, and civilization—an object which every Christian Government is supposed to strive to effect. It is just as well, especially on a colonial frontier, when aiming at the subversion of the barbarous customs of wild but independent savages, the diffusion of Christian doctrines, and the ascendancy of the principles of civilised existence, not to aspire at the same time to declaim loudly about British supremacy."<sup>1</sup>

Every page of the present deplorable correspondence recalls these wise words. If you want to civilise Cctywayo, or to civilise so many of his people as your Gatlings spare, you will not do it by breaking up a system of society which, barbarous as it may seem, is still a sort of polity, and still keeps men together in a state that is a long way removed from the abnormal chaos that will follow the departure of our troops. The Commissioner of 1853, from whom we have just been quoting, points out "how remarkable it is, that in a pastoral race of barbarians they are so little addicted to yield to the temptation of committing depredations" on the herds of their neighbours, unless under the influence of provocation in a time of war. Such a piece of morality is not surprising or remarkable at all. It is childish to let disgust at brutal rites blind us to the fact that in these things too there is a law, and that behind them lies an order which you cannot replace at a stroke by the order and the ideas of

(1) Further Correspondence respecting Orange River Territory, laid before Parliament, April 10, 1854, p. 52.



an advanced society. Nature will not have her hand forced. You cannot forestall the trophies of time. Even assuming it to be the destiny of England to supersede the poor germs of civilisation among these less fortunate members of the human family, it is not by the violent and precipitate annexation of kingdoms and provinces on fraudulent pretexts, that such an end is to be gained. Civilisation would have extended in Zululand in a normal way. The people would have come down to Natal for the railways, and would have been silently influenced by what they saw there. Cetshwayo and his chiefs might have been induced to send children down to Natal to school, as we know them to have been disposed to do.<sup>1</sup> A few hundred pounds expended in such ways as these would have done more to extend our influence peacefully than millions of war-money and long trains of Gatlings. Patience, caution, moderation—but before all else patience—these are the keywords of a true policy if, in professing to civilise South Africa, you are not to re-barbarize England.

The present writer is not one of those who think that war is never necessary, or that war against Aborigines is never justifiable. But war is so tremendous a process, so hideous while it lasts, and after it has come to an end, so far-reaching, so subtle, and often so deadly, both in its material consequences and in its moral reaction on the character alike of conquerors and conquered, that I say it is a process which we are bound to guard with a more religious watchfulness, a more jealous scrupulosity, a sharper anxiety of conscience, than any other part or incident in our whole national life. It has been absurdly contended that the hour of war is no fitting time for judging policy. It is the only time at which we can hope that the public will seriously think of the matter at all; and what is important is that now when the struggle is going on, between the lines of every telegram that tells them of the fine practice of their guns, the valour of their soldiers, and the brilliant successes of their generals, our people should see written in letters of flame that this war is one of the worst crimes that has been perpetrated in our history. We shall be told that this is not patriotism. There has been enough within the last three years of that canting and insolent nonsense. We are as good patriots as they are. We have as much pride as they in the greatness of England, because it has been in the main the greatness of humanity and right. We exult as ardently as they do in the immense realm on which, as they boast, the sun never sets; but we exult in it only because we insist that over the length and breadth of that realm there shall be perpetually shed the beams of the far more radiant and glorious sun of human justice and sovereign beneficence.

EDITOR.

(1) See an article in *Macmillan's Magazine* for March, 1878, entitled *A Visit to King Cetshwayo*.

## FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF THE NEW REPUBLIC.

THE Republic in the true sense of the word is hardly a month old in France, and the difference which a few weeks have produced is already visible on all sides. And it is far more visible to one who observes it on the spot, than it can be to those who catch but faint echoes of the change across the channel, in a hurried column of promiscuous telegrams. As we watch it in the midst of the movement, the prevailing spirit appears as one of confidence. After eight years of struggle France has established a Republic, real, solid, and peaceful. The President, Senate, and Chamber; the ministry, the military and civil services; the government, the electors, the public, the press, speakers and writers, are all at last in fair harmony and working agreement. Whilst the parties hostile to the Republic are disorganized and hopeless to a degree that they have never before appeared, the friends of the constitution appear like men conscious that they have behind them, as no doubt they have, the immense weight of the nation.

The difficulties in the way of this, the greatest political experiment of our age—the closing of the French Revolution, and the founding of a permanent Republic in the midst of monarchic Europe—are still undoubtedly great. They are great both without and within. Wars like that of 1870, and insurrections like that of 1871, are not to be wiped out from the history of a nation in less than a generation. The traces of these great events still float on the surface of the deep calm stream like the foam and the eddies below Niagara. And he would be a very sanguine or a very superficial observer of French politics who should think that, with M. Waddington at the Foreign Affairs, France has nothing to do but to pay compliments and receive them from her European neighbours, or that with M. Grévy for President of the Republic, all French Republicans have got everything that they can desire. Within and without France has her difficulties before her, and one of the best signs of the day is that all serious Frenchmen seem perfectly alive to this fact. Still, on the whole, the tone of the Republican body at least, of all sections of it, from the most hesitating converted Orleanist to the most factious Irreconcilable, exhibits the belief that the French Republic has a better prospect before it than it has ever had before.

It is a time in France of new departures. The Republic governed by Republicans is a new departure, the most emphatic of all. So is the surrender of the old parties. The Bonapartists begin to hedge; Raoul Duval is a good Republican; Baron Haussmann will no

longer sit with the Corsicans; and the *Figaro* forswears politics, much as Falstaff forswears sack. The only surviving minister of Louis Philippe becomes the latest life-senator by the unanimous choice of the Republican majority. The Minister of War rises in the tribune and calmly says, "Without doubt the 'Marscillaise' will be treated by the army as the national air of France." Epauettes and swords are no longer in fashion in official places. The Commander-in-Chief of the French army is a man who never in his life wore a cocked hat, or a particle of lace on his coat; and the French army is practically under civilian control as much as our own. Hardly more soldiers are now to be seen in the streets of Paris than in the streets of London, and nobody but the *bonnes* seem to feel their absence. The new President has but one fixed idea in politics, and that is to efface the person in power, and to exhibit only the power of the law. The Marshal, whom he has just displaced, says, "M. Grévy, you are the most honest man I know!" and the Marshal's friends submit with a good grace. The Republican parties have certainly not decided to agree; but they all agree in saying, "And now to work!" And really the amount of practical work, administrative and legislative, that has been done in the few weeks that have elapsed since M. Grévy became President is something remarkable. The *mot d'ordre* which one hears five times a day (and which even M. Emile de Girardin finds it pay to enforce every evening) is a new departure in itself. "Surtout, point de Blague!" Truly this is a very remarkable result in the ninetieth year since the Feast of Pikes.

In a state of things in which so much is new, the organization of the Government itself is not among the least of the new things. As a problem of constitutional law it will probably be found that the actual constitution of France is a far from simple or familiar experiment. It is anything but easy to analyze the existing system of Government and to determine the proportional weight of its various elements. We are constantly debating the question, wherein lies the true centre of power in the France of to-day? Is the Presidency more like that of the United States, or more like a simple constitutional Monarchy? What are the respective positions in actual power of the President of the Republic, of the First Minister, of the President of the Chamber? Is M. Gambetta in the position of Mr. Brand, or in the position of M. Rouher under the Empire? Is M. Waddington on even terms with Lord Beaconsfield and Prince Bismarck as the prime minister of a party with an immense majority; or is M. Waddington in the same position as Mr. Hayes's Secretary of State? Is M. Grévy the real ruler of France, as Oliver Cromwell was the real ruler of England; or does he occupy the place of the King of the Belgians, of Dr. Schenk, the respected President of

the Swiss Confederation, or of President Hayes in America? Lastly, how far is a Ministry in France the master of the two Houses, or the servant of the two Houses, or of either House? Does the future of the party depend on M. Waddington, on M. Grévy, or on M. Gambetta, or on no one of them?

It is pretty clear that these questions, important as they are, do not admit of any simple answer. The elements of the actual system in France are decidedly complicated, and leave room for a great deal of modification by men and by circumstances. It will be seen that it is open to the First Minister, or to the President of the Republic, or to the President of the Chamber, being, any one of them, a man of transcendent powers, to make himself the real ruler of France when the balance of forces is tolerably even. Down to the beginning of this year, everything was in abeyance. The President of the Republic was the sulky captive of the Chamber of Deputies, which itself was neutralised by a hostile Senate. A ministry had been forced on Marshal Macmahon, whilst it was itself barely tolerated by the Chamber of Deputies. On the other hand, the Chamber could not insist on a ministry after its own heart, or attempt legislation such as it was sent up to promote, because it was checkmated by an adverse Senate, and a practically hostile body of officials. Hence there has been a whole year of simple expectation. The key of the position was the Senatorial election of January 5th. The great Republican triumph brought the two Chambers into effective harmony with each other. This virtually determined the resignation of the Marshal. And that practically involved a new ministry frankly willing to carry out the views of the great Republican majority, not only in active legislation but in recasting the whole administrative body, civil, military, judicial, and diplomatic.

It is obviously open to a man, or to a set of men, with energy and a strong purpose, to determine in a new way the true centre of power. As matters stand, the various powers are feeling their way, and settling into fixed relations. The constitution is still in a somewhat fluid condition. But it can hardly be doubted that of the three powers at present at work, Presidency, Ministry, Chamber, the ministry is the least stable and the least master of the situation. It could indeed hardly be otherwise. For nearly thirty years at least, ministers in France have been rarely anything but agents and servants of some real ruler behind them, and they have never once been the representatives of the national feeling, or even the chiefs of a dominant party. Louis Napoleon chose his ministers; just as he chose his generals or his ambassadors, as the best men whom he could get to serve the immediate purpose. The last thing he ever expected of them was to appear to the nation as rulers, or to represent a party great or small. And he changed them as soon as they failed to

serve the turn, as soon as they seemed to be becoming too unpopular or too powerful. M. Thiers chose ministers with whom he more or less agreed, according as circumstances and the Assembly permitted him to act ; and Marshal Macmahon had various ministers forced on him by invisible coalitions and coteries. But no minister, not even the Duc de Broglie, can be said to have been the real head of a dominant party in the nation. Nor has any minister within these thirty years held power in France by virtue of his commanding a solid parliamentary majority. Parliamentary majorities undoubtedly placed M. Thiers in power, and then Marshal Macmahon ; but they were presidents, not ministers, and their ministers were simply their agents. And, for the present at least, the habits and elements of the Chamber make a settled parliamentary majority, a thing to count on like Lord Beaconsfield's majority, or Count Cavour's majority, entirely impossible in France.

There are, in fact, none of the conditions there which make the Prime Minister in England the real source of power, and the practical embodiment of the dominant policy for the time being. Ministers in France are not at all of necessity members of either Chamber, and they not unfrequently belong to neither. They have the right of addressing the Chamber, but they often appear there simply to be put on their trial. There is no standing parliamentary representative of each department in both houses. The serious work of examining measures almost always takes place in the *bureaux*. And the ministers who are not members of the House are not members of the *bureaux*. It is impossible for ministers, who are public officials, but not, except by accident, members of the Chamber, and who have no control over the business of the House, or over the work of its committees, to obtain what we call an efficient control over the House, or even to form a compact and permanent majority in the House.

On the other hand, if the ministers are not chiefs of a dominant parliamentary party, they have no other representative character. They are not the choice of the nation in any sense ; they hardly ever address the nation as Lord Beaconsfield or Mr. Gladstone does ; and they are very often wholly unknown to the country outside some official or political group. The Prime Minister is himself distinctly nominated by a ruler, and not by his outgoing predecessor, or by a sovereign performing a complimentary duty. He does not select his colleagues in anything like the same sense that an English Prime Minister does ; his colleagues are not at all in the same degree of harmony with him, or in subordination to him, as with us ; and he certainly cannot get rid of them with anything like the same facility. When they meet in council it is not he who presides and leads the council, but the President of the Republic whose ministers

they are, and who, even when he is Marshal Macmahon, is far from being an ornamental and simply nominal chairman.

It is a necessary result of a system which makes political activity centre in the choice of a President of the Republic, that the Prime Minister can hardly be the first power in the State. A great parliamentary statesman might possibly, in course of years, create the conditions in which he might form a party and ultimately occupy the position of Count Cavour or Lord Palmerston; but none of the elements exist at present. We cannot too completely recognise to ourselves that, given the present conditions there, a ministry in France is not the same thing as a ministry in England, and that a change of ministers has much less significance than it has with us. The future of the French Republic depends on things of which the permanence of M. Waddington's Cabinet is one of the least. No one can see M. Waddington and his colleagues sitting on the official bench of the Chamber of Deputies, of which only a small part of them are members (the official bench which has often been merely a dock to so many unlucky ministers), without an irresistible impression that the Prime Minister is in no sense whatever the "leader of the House." He has no control over its business; he attends there to give explanations and to hear remonstrances or advice. But he does not affect, and he does not possess, any acknowledged ascendancy over the Chamber; and it is difficult to see how he can possibly obtain it. M. Waddington is a very popular and a very capable man; but since in the Chamber the business of the day and the conduct of the debate are in the control of M. Gambetta; since in the Senate he has to meet so many politicians of vastly greater experience and reputation; since in council he has to conform to the decisions of M. Grévy, whose position and judgment are alike superior to his own, it is quite clear that M. Waddington is not the person who really holds power in France.

Is the President, then, the preponderant element in the French Republic as he is in the United States? Does M. Grévy hold the place of General Grant, or even of M. Thiers, during his tenure of the office? It cannot be denied that the President of the French holds a very different position from that of the President of the American Republic. The latter is chosen by the entire nation; and his election is the great and almost single battle-field of rival parties. He is elected wholly independently of the two Houses; he can act, and to some extent govern, without them, and in many ways he can appeal over their heads to the nation, his real constituents. Circumstances and the more recent history of the country have brought the Congress into a doubtful position in public opinion, and what the civil war and its consequences gave in importance to the President they took away from the Congress. All these circumstances are

different in France. There the President of the Republic is chosen, not by the nation, but by the two Houses. As a fact, he was little known to the country; his election was a parliamentary *coup de main*, and he is in no sense the chief of a great party. The constitution and recent history have given an immense place to the Senate and the Chamber; and the President of the Republic cannot appear in either. M. Thiers was undoubtedly the head of a great party, and the best-known man in France; and he possessed the right of addressing the Assembly, and exercised it. On the other hand, circumstances have centred the political interest round the Chamber of Deputies; it was in that that the great battle of the Republicans and the reaction was fought. Lastly, the body over which M. Gambetta has so long exercised an ascendancy could not be otherwise than a co-ordinate power, at least, in the State.

Hence the constitution, the late history of France, the forms of the political struggle, and the personality of M. Gambetta, have all created a state of things in which it is far from easy for the President of the Republic to exercise anything like paramount authority. M. Grévy is, in fact, the nominee of a Chamber which circumstances have made the central authority in the nation, which is, in a very singular degree, a representative body, and which is habitually under the control of a man far more popularly known and far more representative than himself. M. Grévy would have, in truth, to strain the constitution, and to undo the work of recent years, if he were bent on making himself the dominant authority in the State. But M. Grévy is the last man in France who would consent to strain the constitution, or who would wish to be the dominant authority anywhere. M. Grévy is an almost fanatical apostle of the idea of no dominant authorities of any kind but the laws and the magistrates. And if the history and the silent forces of France all tend, as I believe they do, towards personal government of some kind, the sole approaches to it seem occupied by a man who has a religious horror of personal government. The remarkable change by which the election of President of the Republic is given to the Chambers and not to the nation is his own cherished principle. To consider himself as the servant of the Chambers, to speak of himself as an impersonal exponent of the law, to sink himself in his public functions as completely as a judge sinks himself in giving judgment, to abstain from presenting himself to the French nation at large, from addressing them, from imposing his will upon them, almost from affecting to speak in their name—this is M. Grévy's idea of a Republican president. Right or wrong, it is not likely that in the hands of a man like that, the office of president will be made the central authority of the State.

It is, therefore, to the two Houses, and especially to the Chamber

of Deputies, that we must look for the real seat of power. Circumstances have all combined to place the lower House in a position of signal importance. Gambetta seized the occasion of the dissolution under the 16th of May to make the struggle almost a duel between the Marshal and his council on the one side, and the "363" Deputies on the other. The 363 are now 383, or more, and may possibly soon nearly reach the famous figure of 400 in a House with a nominal total of 534. It is through them, by them, and in their name, that the great battle of the Republic has been fought. They are, for the most part, working and business politicians, almost all men of local influence, and disciplined by a long and most trying struggle. And, finally, they have been held together, created as a party, and practically trained in politics by M. Gambetta, whom nothing can prevent from being the most dominant person in France. In the Chamber of Deputies, then, lies, for the present at least, the centre of power in France.

At the same time, if this tendency should ultimately settle into a parliamentary government, it will be a parliamentary government of a very new and complex kind. If the Chamber of Deputies ever becomes the dominant element, it must be remembered that it is under conditions which mark it off emphatically from the House of Commons. In the first place, there is the Presidency, which all the traditions of French history, and the tendency of French habits, point out as the natural centre of authority in the nation. And the Presidency is now filled by a man who, if his theories drive him to neutralise his office, is still a man of imposing character and of solid judgment. M. Grévy, in spite of himself, can never quite become a constitutional king. Again, the Senate, if it have a smaller *vis inertiae* than the House of Lords, and is far inferior to it in strength as a purely conservative force, is still made up almost entirely of men whose lives have been passed in public affairs, who have acquired a great reputation of various kinds, and who, whatever else they are, are men of industry and of brains. The Senate in France is not made up of a dozen ex-judges, a dozen ex-ministers, a few hundred lords-lieutenant of spotless propriety and respectable intentions, and a rack of sporting, fashionable, or dilettanti non-entities who are too much bored even to appear in their places. Not one French senator in fifty but has been a hard worker all his life, but who has had, and may still have, his ambitions and his ideas. Consequently, if the Chamber of Deputies is ever to become, as it is becoming, the seat of power, it must do so by remaining in working harmony with both President and Senate.

But there is more. If this is ever to become a parliamentary government, it will be so by a system highly indirect and singularly novel. The actual machinery of Parliament, as now at work in



France, constitutes in fact an experiment in political art of a most interesting and original kind. The parliamentary government, as practised in the Chamber of Deputies, is something totally different from parliamentary government with us, as well as different from the government of Assemblies such as we have hitherto known it in France and elsewhere. What we understand by parliamentary government is one in which laws are passed and the executive is controlled in public sittings of one or more Chambers. With us the House sits for eight or ten hours consecutively; all measures are fully debated, usually several times, in full sitting; not only the principle, but the details and clauses of every bill are there discussed in the entire House, and the entire process of government, as well as that of legislation, goes on under the criticism and subject to the pressure of the great party dualism which is always in full activity. The ministry are practically, if not technically, the choice of the majority of the House of Commons, and are regularly treated as the chiefs and representatives of that majority. On their side they have a paramount influence over that majority, and consequently over the House and the entire Parliament. No serious measure has a chance of success unless it initiates with them or is adopted by them. The ministry also practically controls the entire business of the House, and becomes responsible for the public action of Parliament, since it does in effect determine that action. Again, the general course of policy, as well as every important measure, is criticised and defended from day to day in a perpetual series of great public debates. The House of Commons becomes in truth an immense Cabinet, in which, under full publicity and by its oratorical and parliamentary resources, the Government carries on its work before the nation by means of a recognised and unhesitating majority.

In the typical continental Assembly or Convention, the Government is of an even more democratic type, inasmuch as the ministry is usually a mere agency of the Chamber, and there is no settled and disciplined majority which follows its party chiefs with unhesitating obedience. The consequence is that measures and policies are publicly debated in a more or less oratorical fashion, and are frequently determined under great excitement as the result of a stormy interchange of speeches. A government like this ceases to have much continuity, and degenerates often into government by public meeting, as our system too often degenerates into government by artificial parties.

Now the French system at present at work is something totally different from both systems just described. The key of it lies in the fact that the true business is carried on, not in the public sittings, but in the small private committees. At this moment these committees are eleven in number, in a House actually of five hundred

and twenty members. The usual attendance is about thirty, and it seldom exceeds forty. The eleven *bureaux* are chosen by lot out of the entire House, so that a minority is usually able to win one or more of the *bureaux*. The special committees are formed by each of these *bureaux* choosing a member. And all the great questions are referred to select committees thus chosen. In them, and not in the public sittings, the work is seriously done. These smaller committees usually sit in private. None but members are present, and the discussions are not made public. The committee chooses its own chairman and its own reporter. The report is ultimately submitted to the entire House, which has the right to accept it or modify it at will. But the effect of a carefully considered report by a committee so doubly sifted is usually decisive, and the recommendations of the committee are for the most part accepted.

The mode in which it works is thus. A measure of great public importance—say the law on the Amnesty—is proposed by the Government. Instead of the Minister introducing his measure to the whole House in a long and elaborate speech, he simply reads his *projet de loi*. This, without any public discussion, is referred to the *bureaux*. In these eleven *bureaux* into which the House is divided by lot, the bill is debated. Explanations of the ministers are demanded and various amendments are considered, as they can be in committees consisting of about thirty persons, where oratorical exuberance is out of the question. The eleven *bureaux*, after debate and sufficient consideration, choose each a member of the select committee, or in some cases each *bureau* chooses two members; and to this select committee the measure is finally referred. The select committee again appoints its sub-committee to examine a special branch of the question. The select committee, as does that on the electoral inquiry into the elections of October, 1877, may act with the most complete secrecy, it can prepare a report in any form, and it is usually armed with all the powers of the House. On the report of the select committee to the House the public debate is opened. But the question by that time has frequently been sifted, arranged, or decided “in the lobbies;” a few speeches are let off; the report has an enormous advantage, both in form and in information, over any outside member; and the House, if the majority are satisfied with the committee, usually pass the measure at once.

The public sittings are very often, in fact, only a sort of solemnity and free vent for grievances, vanities, crotchets, and warnings. They at present only occupy two or three hours upon four days of the week. Even then the *clôture* at once acts as a stopper upon any obstructive tactics, and the habits of most French orators lead them to say what they have to say in twenty or thirty minutes at the outside. An interpellation, that is, an attack on a minister of

the bitterest and most dangerous kind, will be all fired off in eight or ten sentences, and the minister's reply is over in as many minutes. With us when Mr. Gladstone makes "observations," and the Government "reply" in form, it often occupies the best part of a week. But at Versailles they hardly understand these things yet ; a public sitting of two hours will dispose of two or three interpellations, will hear two or three ministers bring in each a bill, receive the reports of two or three select committees, listen or not listen to a long harangue from a Bonapartist or an Irreconcilable, will pass five or six laws that have been duly worked out in committee, will do an immense amount of informal work in the lobbies, and will get back to Paris to dinner by six or seven.

It is plain that this is not parliamentary government in our sense, and in fact it is parliamentary government of an altogether new order. It is, in fact, government by select committees. These select committees, it must be remembered, are chosen by a double system of choice ; they work in secret, and they are directed to sift technical and administrative details. They are no doubt like our select committees, except that they are differently appointed ; they have a more representative character ; and whereas our great party questions are very rarely referred to a select committee, in France the most burning questions are absolutely intrusted to these bodies, and their decision is usually decisive. There are now sitting in Paris select committees on the great impeachment question and the election of 1877, on the amnesty bill, on the liberty of the press, on the right of public meeting, on lay education, on the conscription for the army, on the budget, and a number of similar questions of prime importance. The work of these special committees is in some ways more like that of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, than a mere "select committee" of the House of Commons. They are not appointed to shelve questions, to find a working compromise, or to collect a body of facts and opinions. In France they are distinctly appointed in order to work out the great questions, and to direct legislation and the executive. And they usually do the work very thoroughly and very speedily.

An institution like this must obviously acquire in time a preponderant influence over public affairs, if only they are prepared to work hard, and can avoid conflicts amongst themselves and with the other powers in the State. Hitherto, it would seem, they retain a complete discipline, and give themselves honestly to work. The aspect, indeed, of the French deputies is strongly suggestive of work. There is a total absence of that turfite and mess-room element which gives such distinction to some more ancient parliaments. Except on the Bonapartist seats there is a singular absence of very young men ; and the revolutionary type is conspicuous by

its absence. The dandy, the club-orator, the millionaire is not obtrusive. Most of them look like business men, of a rather economical turn. They might be merchants going on 'Change, or shareholders in a railway going to a meeting. As a matter of fact, the immense majority of the Republican deputies are men of nothing but local reputation and influence, who have been chosen for their business habits and their skill in marshalling the party in their departments.

Of course a body like this must require some guiding spirit to keep them at work and in harmony. This the Chamber of Deputies has hitherto had in M. Gambetta. It is he who practically has organized this system of work by small select committees, meeting and discussing in private, and keeping a strict control over the entire action of government and legislation. His own particular committee, that of the budget, has been a type of the new method of parliamentary control. Now there is no reason to suppose that M. Gambetta will, in any sense, cease to direct this business activity of the Chamber. On the contrary, as President, he will be able to give a more general and systematic direction to it than he could as a private member. What has occurred that the influence of M. Gambetta should be lessened with the Republican majority? When we reflect, we shall perceive that his influence rested in a very small degree on his speeches in the tribune. Under the Dufaure Ministry he appeared there very little, and in the great crises he often did not appear at all. His work was done in his seat, in the lobbies, in the committee rooms, in informal and secret consultations. No man probably ever acquired so great an influence over any Chamber who so seldom made great speeches in it. About the fact of his ascendancy there can be no doubt whatever. It was similar to that exercised by Deak in the Hungarian Chamber, and was acquired by very similar means. It was the result of immense knowledge and resources, untiring industry and patience in all kinds of business, and a large temper and sympathy with every part of the national opinion. It was an influence gained by superior knowledge, superior judgment, and by the imposing prestige of vast political sagacity.

The President in the Chamber of Deputies occupies a dominant place visible to the eye, and patent in every act. He practically arranges the business of the House, in the same way as the "Leader of the House" does with us. He has all the authority which the Speaker with us might have, if he were at once Mr. Brand and Sir Stafford Northcote. He has a perfect right to take part in the debates; and M. Gambetta will do so whenever it is needful. He will probably make nearly as many speeches in the tribune as he has done in the present Chamber as deputy. He determines the mode in which every question is put, the order in which all business

is taken, and the proper form of dealing with each incident, law, or debate. He is expected to keep deputies straight, to lecture them, to cross-examine them, to correct their bad logic, and to rebuke them for silly remarks. He can also interfere when he thinks them wandering from the question, and also when he thinks they deserve a better hearing than they get. All this is quite traditional and accepted. M. Dupin would say, "I really cannot let you make such an exhibition of yourself." And M. de Morny would smile cruelly at an orator whom he had interrupted, and say, "Well, well, go on, monsieur." M. Grévy, the impeccable and impassive Rhadamanthus of the Republic, never of course descended to this outrageous insolence, nor will M. Gambetta. M. Grévy did everything he could to reduce the President to the level of the Speaker as a simple official of the House. But it is quite impossible that M. Gambetta, the first member of Parliament in France, can henceforth be less so, because he is officially President.

The President of the Chamber, be it remembered, is *ex officio* member of all the select committees; and it is part of his duty to see that their work is done with dispatch and in due order. M. Gambetta is at this moment President of the Budget Committee, and he will in all probability himself move the report of it in the tribune before the House. The President of the lower House, who is himself the reporter on the Budget Committee, who has paramount ascendancy in the House, is thus practically, if not officially, the real Chancellor of the Exchequer; most assuredly when the Government is not very strong, and is nearly his own nomination. And this ascendancy which in the Committee on the Budget, the most important of all, M. Gambetta exercises in a direct way, he will exercise in a more or less indirect way over all the other committees. He will have the legal authority to press them for their report; he can, if he think fit, himself take part in their sittings and press upon them his advice. Without actually controlling their report, he can require the report to be made, and perhaps can do much to colour its effect. Even if the public sittings of the Chamber were the truly essential feature, which they are not, a President, even if he were not M. Gambetta, would have a predominant influence. But since the real work of the Chamber is done out of the public sittings, the President, being as he is M. Gambetta, will be the practical source of power. The President of the Chamber of Deputies, be he who he may, is in no sense a Speaker. He is legally the second authority in France, always at hand to take the place of the first; and who if he be a man of great capacity and energy, may be actually the first in fact, if not in name.

As President of the public sittings M. Gambetta bids fair to become a most striking success. He is courteous, firm, patient, just,

and business-like. His complete knowledge of the rules and work of the House, his inexhaustible command of parliamentary tactics, his skill and energy in repartee and sudden emergencies, his *bon-homie*, his good sense and entire belief in the dignity of his office, are already making themselves felt on both sides of the House. He is vociferously applauded by the Right when he cuts a Republican orator short on a point of order; and the whole Chamber is charmed when he begs them to listen to a tedious attack on a minister, "for the right of interpellation should be jealously guarded by the deputies, even when it is pushed," he cruelly adds, "to the point of exaggeration." M. Gambetta bids fair to make such a president as Lord Palmerston might have been, if he had had the constitutional task of being at once the leader of the House as well as the Speaker.

But it is not in the public sittings that the real duties of his own office or of the Chamber he directs should be looked for. The public are coming to find out that the real business is done out of sight. The new fashion in France is to work and not to talk. The serious journals, the deputies, the senate, the public utterances of all the leading authorities, ring with nothing but work, work! In season and out of season, in public, in private, in his journal, and in the Chamber, M. Gambetta preaches on the text with which he closed his last great speech—*Laboremus*. He has taken that for the motto of the new régime. And the whole of his energy and power of infusing ideas is bent on filling the public mind and the mind of the deputies with the same conception of work. One can easily see how, with such a man and such a situation, with a body of deputies and of senators who, whatever else they are, are hardworking men, such an idea makes itself felt. M. Gambetta himself sets the example. Within a week he had introduced punctuality in the sittings, dispatch in the committees, and a general standard of industry and method.

Since this is the case, it is plain that M. Gambetta had some distinct purpose in view when he stepped from the benches to the President's chair. The history of the crisis of January can be written without any "secret information," or any "unimpeachable authorities." As things stood, M. Gambetta had no immediate prospect of being elected President of the Republic. He possibly thinks it doubtful if the President of the Republic is the real master of the situation. At any rate it was practically not open to him, and he hardly desires it as yet. He did not aim at being Prime Minister, or any minister, for the very good reason that a minister holds not a very important, and certainly not a very secure place. But as M. Gambetta could not have the first place in France, he very naturally chose that which is the second place in authority, and which he may possibly make the

first in real influence. He is, in spite of popular impression to the contrary, a man who from his earliest youth has been a most enormous worker. His whole ascendancy has been gained by work and not by speech. He has an incredible power of business; and his aim seems now to infuse into the Chamber he presides over the genius of work, and to make it by work the real leader of France.

If this result be attained, it will be undoubtedly a new and remarkable form of parliamentary government. It will be free in a great measure from some of the serious defects which have been urged against parliamentary government. Legislation and administration will be criticised and controlled not by an unwieldy and floating Assembly under the influence of the artificial excitement of debate, but by small committees, trained to work, and examining each question in a more patient and judicial way. The interruptions of factious orators, of bores, and crotchet-mongers, will be relegated to the comparatively harmless arena of the public sittings. The business men, and the practical men, will gain a considerable ascendancy; and the fluent expounders of "eternal principles" will have a very limited hearing. Each minister will find himself face to face with a select committee of the House, the members of which are mostly as well-informed as himself, and who can sift his projects far better in private sittings than in the storm of set debates. Of course the whole of this scheme of parliamentary control would break to pieces unless the Chamber itself could furnish an adequate supply of competent men with energy and zeal to make the committees real: But that is exactly what the present Chamber of Deputies does present. It has an unusual number of men of industrious habits and business capacity, and an unusually small proportion of men with a turn for rhetoric. No doubt, also, the machinery would break down if the Chamber fell into serious disaccord with the Senate or the President and his ministers. But at present there exists a substantial agreement. Lastly, no such system could long cohere without a guiding spirit to keep the party together, to spur the committees to combined activity, and to give them in effect a definite and common policy. But this guiding spirit the party has long had in M. Gambetta. There seems every ground for believing that he has now acquired a position where this influence may be exerted in a far more thorough and systematic manner, and that without infringing on the letter or spirit of the constitution, and without the semblance of personal dictation. I retain in the strongest way my own private conviction, the settled conviction of our school, that the government of France, however completely Republican, should be frankly and openly personal in form. I believe that nothing else but personal leadership is suited to the genius of the nation or can long be permanent in that country. I believe that France, of all countries, is peculiarly unfitted for parliamentary government in its

crude and direct form, and that every attempt to found a real parliamentary government in France necessarily deviates into a closer and more personal system. As a very real modification of the parliamentary system, as a compromise and transitional expedient, and especially as a disguised and softened form of personal government, the present system may do good service, and may lead to a permanent solution. It is a parliamentary system in which some of the worst vices of the parliamentary system are eliminated: a personal government in which some of the greatest stumbling-blocks of personal government are effectually neutralised or concealed.

With all this there is no reason why the difficulties and risks in the way of the Republic, great as they are, should not be successfully dealt with. The great burdens which cramp and weigh down the Republic may be summed up under two heads. The first is the fatal legacy of democratic dogma which it has received from the zealots who founded the new era in Europe. The second is that curse which it inherits from all preceding governments for centuries—the belief that it can alter opinions by laws, and can reform social states by the arm of the judge and the sword of the police. The two things above all others needful are the Republic without the fanaticism of democracy, and an orderly government with entire liberty of opinion. What is wanted is a real Republic, animated by a Republican spirit, aiming at Republican objects, using Republican methods; but centred in and directed by a capable man. There are strong tendencies in that direction, and the current of things is continually creating it anew; but no one of the Republican spokesmen can venture to surrender the purest shibboleths of democracy. What else is wanted is a government strong enough to maintain unbroken peace and a perfect respect for law, but which shall abandon all thought of punishing ideas, and shall make men feel that they must extirpate pernicious theories by confuting them, and not by silencing them. A society which is perpetually appealing to the jailer will never seriously apply itself to argument.

Great progress has undoubtedly been made in both directions. The difference between the Republic of M. Grévy and of M. Gambetta and the Republic of M. Lamartine and M. Ledru-Rollin is simply incalculable. The present Chamber of Deputies is utterly different from the Assembly of 1848; and the gulf, or rather antagonism, between the cities and the peasantry, as it existed at that date, is a thing of the past. The Republic is vastly better than its own democratic creed; but that old democratic creed it cannot bring itself to surrender. M. Grévy, his ministers, and the leading politicians about them, are capable as well as honourable men. But it may be doubted if, in a country spontaneously set as a whole towards the lead of a man or of men, they may not carry too far their cherished theory of presenting the Republic as a coldly impersonal type.



Their faith is that good government, equity, and peace will gradually extinguish all interest in the men by whom these are secured. Whilst the work is really done this may be so.

The problems they have to solve are not so severe but that patience and good sense may suffice to the work. They almost all may belong to the same class, for they arise out of the inveterate prejudices of ages that the duty of governments is to act on opinions by ordering this and by forbidding that. The demands of the most extreme Irreconcilable, as of the most extreme Ultramontane, turn round the same problem—liberty of discussion. No government in France, no party, no section, seems ever able to bring itself to suffer those who differ from it to express their own opinions. The Catholic thinks it his duty, having the power, to silence the unbeliever who desires to celebrate the merits of Voltaire; the unbeliever feels it his duty to prevent the Catholics from chanting hymns in the streets; the moderate Republican regards it as a crime not to suppress the witticisms of Rochefort; and the ultra Republican is wild at the thought that Christian Brothers should teach little children. One and all in various degrees commit the same error, that they cannot distinguish illegal acts from pernicious opinions. Each insists that a body of men having the arm of the law, soldiers and police at hand, who neglect to punish the pernicious opinion, and to the utmost of their means exterminate the pernicious opinion, must secretly approve his doctrine, and are practically aiding him with the whole force of the State. A vicious circle is thus established. First one party and then another comes into power, and each in turn proceeds to exterminate the opposite opinions. The result is a perpetual and interminable outcry for liberty from one party or the other. And from this the only possible issue is a party or a man with the courage and good sense to lay down the simple principle that the State is responsible for order, and not for ideas, that it will suppress illegal acts and direct incitation to illegal acts, but that it has nothing whatever to do with opinions, however pernicious, and manifestations of feeling, however disgraceful.

Both in this country and in France we hear a great deal of nonsense about the extreme parties, and the extreme measures, and the violence of the ultra Republicans, and the terrible dangers of revolutionary fury. With many unthinking persons a complete glossary of cant has grown out of these big phrases. If these gloomy prophets would but ask themselves definitely what are the "extreme" measures which they foresee with such horror, the extreme measures will be found to resolve themselves for the most part into a number of vapid people talking much grandiloquent stuff in public, and some hare-brained enthusiasts proposing many very silly schemes. The violence of the ultra Republicans means a scheme, which is yet quite in its infancy in France, to separate the

State from the Church. Mr. Miall and Mr. Carvell Williams are far more "violent" in this matter than M. Victor Hugo and M. Louis Blanc, for the latter do not venture to suggest that the churches and cathedrals, buildings and lands of the Church should in any way be taken from its hands. Yet disestablishment can become in England a practical parliamentary question, is discussed on platforms and in chapels, and elaborate schemes for disendowing the Church are propounded and circulated. In France, such is the height to which cant has grown on the matter, the mildest proposal of disestablishment as a problem for the future is treated as a proof of "revolutionary violence."

Another extreme idea is that M. Rochefort should be permitted to sign his name to articles in French newspapers. Now M. Henri Rochefort has written his dismal snippets in Parisian papers for years, which nobody reads and nobody minds, sometimes under the recognised mark of "\*\*\*," sometimes as "Henri R. \*." Under the Marshal and the Duc de Broglie, these perfectly vapid sneers came out day after day, and no one was a bit the worse or a bit the better. And now, under the Republic, society is to be shaken to its foundations because at the end of the same stuff "Henri Rochefort" is to be read instead of "Henri R. \*." So, too, half-a-dozen exiles have been writing in newspapers for years. What good they could do, or what harm they could do, is done already. Yet one of the extreme measures is, that men who have lost whatever influence they ever had, who are very poor writers and singularly helpless in action, are to be allowed to write their fatiguing rhodomontade in Paris, where it is published, instead of actually writing it in London, Brussels, or Geneva.

So, too, another extreme measure is the abrogation of that disgraceful law which prevents twenty persons from meeting in a public room to discuss politics. A violation of freedom which every English political party would resent as the worst oppression, is defended as the bulwark of society by every man who calls himself "moderate," or "temperate," or "prudent," in France. We know full well that a government which cannot permit a public meeting to be held (subject to its own police regulations), or which only permits it by an idle artifice, has yet to learn the simplest elements of good or permanent order. Yet the cant in France is that it would be an extreme measure to permit open meetings to be held.

So, too, it would be an extreme measure to allow a trades union to be formed or to give it a legal recognition. Another extreme measure would be the withdrawal of the priests and religious confraternities from the primary public schools. No one desires to suppress the ecclesiastical schools, or to prevent the children of those who desire it from joining them. The simple demand is, that the schools which are entirely national or muni-

cial shall not be intrusted to the hands of priests. There is a great deal to be said about secular public instruction in France, as in England, and difficulties undoubtedly occur which may require complex legislation. But to pretend that a proposal to withdraw all municipal primary schools from the control of priests is an act of "revolutionary fury," is enough to raise a smile even from Mr. Forster.

Another extreme measure, which, by the way, has hardly a chance of passing, is the restoration of the law of Napoleon authorising a legal divorce in cases similar to those of our own law. It does not need to be an admirer of the "sacred right of divorce" to see that a proposal to introduce it in a country where divorce is absolutely refused, is hardly an act of revolutionary fury. Yet such is the length to which party heat has carried political cant that we are gravely assured, not only in French but in English newspapers, that the family, property, society, order, religion, the education of youth, and the morality of the age, are in imminent danger of perishing together, if men in Paris are so much as allowed to meet and discuss politics, to form trade societies, to write and read newspapers as they please, to pay no taxes for priests whom they abjure, to support no schools which are directed by ecclesiastics, to express their opinion about God or man in a legal and orderly way, if they are allowed to be married or buried without the intervention of the priest, so much as to propose schemes for the separation of Church and State, or for the restoration of the faculty of legal divorce.

Yet these things form the sum and substance of the entire political demands of the extreme Left. M. Louis Blanc and M. Victor Hugo are undoubtedly the authorised exponents of the extreme wing of the Irreconcilables. It is known to Europe, as much as to France, that both of them are men of noble character, of entire sincerity, and of the gentlest nature. The demands that they make are beyond question the real and full demands of the party they lead. What is it, then, that they demand? Nothing, absolutely nothing but what is already the commonplace of English political life, and the denial of which would set English parties of any shade in a fever of indignation. Here are their demands:—

1. The freedom to Frenchmen to meet and discuss public affairs subject to reasonable police regulations, and subject to every man answering for his words according to the law of sedition and libel.

2. Freedom to all Frenchmen to found, publish, write, or read any newspaper, pamphlet, or political manifesto, subject again to the common law of sedition and libel, but without the interference or censure of government or police.

3. Freedom to all Frenchmen to form associations of any kind—industrial, social, or political—without government intervention,

subject always to the common law of treason, sedition, libel, and fraud.

4. Withdrawal of all public and municipal primary schools from the control of priests.

5. Reduction of the term of conscription and its application to all citizens equally.

6. Restoration of the law of the code Napoleon admitting the possibility of divorce.

7. Consideration of schemes for the ultimate separation of Church and State.

8. A complete amnesty for the political offences eight years old.

These are the whole of the demands put forward by the extreme wing of the Left. Those who talk so readily of extreme men and revolutionary fury should point to something more than this, if they knew it.

As to the amnesty measure, about which so much cant and timidity is shown, it is not at all solved by being trifled with. Here is the case of a few hundred insurgents, mostly club talkers or writers in the petty press, who after a most cruel extermination of their party, are dragging out a frothy existence in foreign cities or in prisons and penal settlements. No one affects to think that they can do anything, no one rates their influence high; they are divided, crushed, and despairing. Those of them who please write daily in the press of Paris, with no particular result. No one can prove that they individually committed any definite crime except the crime of taking part in the most hideous civil war, in which all individual responsibility was lost, and except in some cases the purely technical crime of "usurping public functions," a matter of course in all civil wars. Yet after a slaughter of some twenty thousand, the imprisonment and transportation of some ten thousand more, eight years of misery and exile, the existence of the Republic is supposed to depend on the continued exile of a few men whom no one pretends to fear, and who are now doing all that they have to do for good or for evil. To say that there is a time for all things, a time when party vengeance may be said to have done enough, a time when the Republic is strong enough to draw a veil over the horrible orgies of party excess on one side as much as the other, is to preach assassination, to justify anarchy, arson, and plunder.

Englishmen, at any rate, who are not under the blinding influence of party spirit, may fairly refuse to accept that dishonest and cowardly cant which insists on certain political maxims, not because they are wise or just, but simply to soothe the alarms of certain ignorant peasants. No one really thinks that free political meetings could do any harm; but what might be said might frighten the country electors. No one would care a rush whether Jules Vallés wrote his flowery diatribes in Paris or in London; but the provinces

would be shocked if they learned that the Republic had forgotten Jules Vallés. No one really wishes to give the children's schools to the priests and brothers ; but the *curés* would be terribly annoyed to learn that it was intended to withdraw them. No one cares a straw that a few newspapers dilate on the "social liquidation ;" but it is reassuring to ignorant countrymen to hear that the newspapers have been fined and prosecuted. No one is in the least afraid himself ; but everybody is desperately afraid that somebody else will be afraid. And the "somebody" else turns out to be the most ignorant and prejudiced class in the nation. And so, under pretext of being "moderate," and of discountenancing all "excesses," oppression and suppression are treated as the basis of the Republic, and murderous rancour is the only test of civic virtue.

If the Republic is to be really strong and lasting, it must cast off this affectation of showing its moderation by its force of repression. A Republic cannot be established by the methods of Imperialism. The only *raison d'être* of a Republic is that it should deal with acts, but leave opinions free. If it guarantees complete order, and promotes the prosperity of the country, the peasants will come to see that it has done its true part, and that it is no part of its function to school the public into sound views. As to the past, it must be remembered that both parties, reactionists and revolutionists, have at least as much to be forgotten and forgiven. If it is a crime to set fire to public buildings, it is a crime to massacre ten or twenty thousand people in cold blood, against not one in one hundred of whom anything could be proved, except that they had taken part in civil war. The Republic must have confidence, and it must inspire confidence by its own principles, and not by its zeal in punishing editors. And the first of its principles must be that citizens shall be free to express their opinions. A "social question" there is, and not all the policemen and soldiers in Europe will suffice to prevent that social question from making itself felt. Prince Bismarck may "go pig-sticking" among his Social Democrats, and M. Grévy may have editors fined ; but the social question will be in the front all the same. And the first duty of the Republic is to convince men in cities and in villages alike, that it has no call to interfere in the social question, that it will keep order and secure material well-being whilst the social question is debated and considered. The Republic has a fair prospect before it ; it hears all men speak all good things of it, but it must show Republican confidence in itself. The one thing which we have a right to ask from the Republic is this, that it will put an end to the miserable system of so long a succession of governments which have sought first of all to extirpate ideas instead of promoting the welfare of the public.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

## CHAPTERS ON SOCIALISM.<sup>1</sup>

BY JOHN STUART MILL.

---

### THE SOCIALIST OBJECTIONS TO THE PRESENT ORDER OF SOCIETY EXAMINED.

It is impossible to deny that the considerations brought to notice in the preceding chapter make out a frightful case either against the existing order of society, or against the position of man himself in this world. How much of the evils should be referred to the one, and how much to the other, is the principal theoretic question which has to be resolved. But the strongest case is susceptible of exaggeration; and it will have been evident to many readers, even from the passages I have quoted, that such exaggeration is not wanting in the representations of the ablest and most candid Socialists. Though much of their allegations is unanswerable, not a little is the result of errors in political economy; by which, let me say once for all, I do not mean the rejection of any practical rules of policy which have been laid down by political economists, I mean ignorance of economic facts, and of the causes by which the economic phenomena of society as it is, are actually determined.

In the first place, it is unhappily true that the wages of ordinary labour, in all the countries of Europe, are wretchedly insufficient to supply the physical and moral necessities of the population in any tolerable measure. But, when it is further alleged that even this insufficient remuneration has a tendency to diminish; that there is, in the words of M. Louis Blanc, *une baisse continue des salaires*; the assertion is in opposition to all accurate information, and to many notorious facts. It has yet to be proved that there is any country in the civilised world where the ordinary wages of labour, estimated either in money or in articles of consumption, are declining; while in many they are, on the whole, on the increase; and an increase which is becoming, not slower, but more rapid. There are, occasionally, branches of industry which are being gradually superseded by something else, and, in those, until production accommodates itself to demand, wages are depressed; which is an evil, but a temporary one, and would admit of great alleviation even in the present system of social economy. A diminution thus produced of the reward of labour in some particular employment is the effect and the evidence of increased remuneration, or of a new source of remuneration, in some other; the total and the average remuneration being undi-

(1) Continued from the *Fortnightly Review* for February.

minished, or even increased. To make out an appearance of diminution in the rate of wages in any leading branch of industry, it is always found necessary to compare some month or year of special and temporary depression at the present time, with the average rate, or even some exceptionally high rate, at an earlier time. The vicissitudes are no doubt a great evil, but they were as frequent and as severe in former periods of economical history as now. The greater scale of the transactions, and the greater number of persons involved in each fluctuation, may make the fluctuation appear greater, but though a larger population affords more sufferers, the evil does not weigh heavier on each of them individually. There is much evidence of improvement, and none, that is at all trustworthy, of deterioration, in the mode of living of the labouring population of the countries of Europe; when there is any appearance to the contrary it is local or partial, and can always be traced either to the pressure of some temporary calamity, or to some bad law or unwise act of government which admits of being corrected, while the permanent causes all operate in the direction of improvement.

M. Louis Blanc, therefore, while showing himself much more enlightened than the older school of levellers and democrats, inasmuch as he recognises the connection between low wages and the over-rapid increase of population, appears to have fallen into the same error which was at first committed by Malthus and his followers, that of supposing that because population has a greater power of increase than subsistence, its pressure upon subsistence must be always growing more severe. The difference is that the early Malthusians thought this an irrepressible tendency, while M. Louis Blanc thinks that it can be repressed, but only under a system of Communism. It is a great point gained for truth when it comes to be seen that the tendency to over-population is a fact which Communism, as well as the existing order of society, would have to deal with. And it is much to be rejoiced at that this necessity is admitted by the most considerable chiefs of all existing schools of Socialism. Owen and Fourier, no less than M. Louis Blanc, admitted it, and claimed for their respective systems a pre-eminent power of dealing with this difficulty. However this may be, experience shows that in the existing state of society the pressure of population on subsistence, which is the principal cause of low wages, though a great, is not an increasing evil; on the contrary, the progress of all that is called civilisation has a tendency to diminish it, partly by the more rapid increase of the means of employing and maintaining labour, partly by the increased facilities opened to labour for transporting itself to new countries and unoccupied fields of employment, and partly by a general improvement in the intelligence and prudence of the population. This progress, no doubt, is slow; but it is

much that such progress should take place at all, while we are still only in the first stage of that public movement for the education of the whole people, which when more advanced must add greatly to the force of all the two causes of improvement specified above. It is, of course, open to discussion what form of society has the greatest power of dealing successfully with the pressure of population on subsistence, and on this question there is much to be said for Socialism; what was long thought to be its weakest point will, perhaps, prove to be one of its strongest. But it has no just claim to be considered as the sole means of preventing the general and growing degradation of the mass of mankind through the peculiar tendency of poverty to produce over-population. Society as at present constituted is not descending into that abyss, but gradually, though slowly, rising out of it, and this improvement is likely to be progressive if bad laws do not interfere with it.

Next, it must be observed that Socialists generally, and even the most enlightened of them, have a very imperfect and one-sided notion of the operation of competition. They see half its effects, and overlook the other half; they regard it as an agency for grinding down every one's remuneration—for obliging every one to accept less wages for his labour, or a less price for his commodities, which would be true only if every one had to dispose of his labour or his commodities to some great monopolist, and the competition were all on one side. They forget that competition is a cause of high prices and values as well as of low; that the buyers of labour and of commodities compete with one another as well as the sellers; and that if it is competition which keeps the prices of labour and commodities as low as they are, it is competition which prevents them from falling still lower. In truth, when competition is perfectly free on both sides, its tendency is not specially either to raise or to lower the price of articles, but to equalise it; to level inequalities of remuneration, and to reduce all to a general average, a result which, in so far as realised (no doubt very imperfectly), is, on Socialistic principles, desirable. But if, disregarding for the time that part of the effects of competition which consists in keeping up prices, we fix our attention on its effect in keeping them down, and contemplate this effect in reference solely to the interest of the labouring classes, it would seem that if competition keeps down wages, and so gives a motive to the labouring classes to withdraw the labour market from the full influence of competition, if they can, it must on the other hand have credit for keeping down the prices of the articles on which wages are expended, to the great advantage of those who depend on wages. To meet this consideration Socialists, as we said in our quotation from M. Louis Blanc, are reduced to affirm that the low prices of commodities produced by competition are delusive, and



lead in the end to higher prices than before, because when the richest competitor has got rid of all his rivals, he commands the market and can demand any price he pleases. Now, the commonest experience shows that this state of things, under really free competition, is wholly imaginary. The richest competitor neither does nor can get rid of all his rivals, and establish himself in exclusive possession of the market; and it is not the fact that any important branch of industry or commerce formerly divided among many has become, or shows any tendency to become, the monopoly of a few.

The kind of policy described is sometimes possible where, as in the case of railways, the only competition possible is between two or three great companies, the operations being on too vast a scale to be within the reach of individual capitalists; and this is one of the reasons why businesses which require to be carried on by great joint-stock enterprises cannot be trusted to competition, but, when not reserved by the State to itself, ought to be carried on under conditions prescribed, and, from time to time, varied by the State, for the purpose of insuring to the public a cheaper supply of its wants than would be afforded by private interest in the absence of sufficient competition. But in the ordinary branches of industry no one rich competitor has it in his power to drive out all the smaller ones. Some businesses show a tendency to pass out of the hands of many small producers or dealers into a smaller number of larger ones; but the cases in which this happens are those in which the possession of a larger capital permits the adoption of more powerful machinery, more efficient by more expensive processes, or a better organized and more economical mode of carrying on business, and thus enables the large dealer legitimately and permanently to supply the commodity cheaper than can be done on the small scale; to the great advantage of the consumers, and therefore of the labouring classes, and diminishing, *pro tanto*, that waste of the resources of the community so much complained of by Socialists, the unnecessary multiplication of mere distributors, and of the various other classes whom Fourier calls the parasites of industry. When this change is effected, the larger capitalists, either individual or joint-stock, among which the business is divided, are seldom, if ever, in any considerable branch of commerce, so few as that competition shall not continue to act between them; so that the saving in cost, which enabled them to undersell the small dealers, continues afterwards, as at first, to be passed on, in lower prices, to their customers. The operation, therefore, of competition in keeping down the prices of commodities, including those on which wages are expended, is not illusive but real, and, we may add, is a growing, not a declining, fact.

But there are other respects, equally important, in which the charges brought by Socialists against competition do not admit of so complete

an answer. Competition is the best security for cheapness, but by no means a security for quality. In former times, when producers and consumers were less numerous, it was a security for both. The market was not large enough nor the means of publicity sufficient to enable a dealer to make a fortune by continually attracting new customers : his success depended on his retaining those that he had ; and when a dealer furnished good articles, or when he did not, the fact was soon known to those whom it concerned, and he acquired a character for honest or dishonest dealing of more importance to him than the gain that would be made by cheating casual purchasers. But on the great scale of modern transactions, with the great multiplication of competition and the immense increase in the quantity of business competed for, dealers are so little dependent on permanent customers that character is much less essential to them, while there is also far less certainty of their obtaining the character they deserve. The low prices which a tradesman advertises are known, to a thousand for one who has discovered for himself or learned from others, that the bad quality of the goods is more than an equivalent for their cheapness ; while at the same time the much greater fortunes now made by some dealers excite the cupidity of all, and the greed of rapid gain substitutes itself for the modest desire to make a living by their business. In this manner, as wealth increases and greater prizes seem to be within reach, more and more of a gambling spirit is introduced into commerce ; and where this prevails not only are the simplest maxims of prudence disregarded, but all, even the most perilous, forms of pecuniary improbity receive a terrible stimulus. This is the meaning of what is called the intensity of modern competition. It is further to be mentioned that when this intensity has reached a certain height, and when a portion of the producers of an article or the dealers in it have resorted to any of the modes of fraud, such as adulteration, giving short measure, &c., of the increase of which there is now so much complaint, the temptation is immense on these to adopt the fraudulent practices, who would not have originated them ; for the public are aware of the low prices fallaciously produced by the frauds, but do not find out at first, if ever, that the article is not worth the lower price, and they will not go on paying a higher price for a better article, and the honest dealer is placed at a terrible disadvantage. Thus the frauds, begun by a few, become customs of the trade, and the morality of the trading classes is more and more deteriorated.

On this point, therefore, Socialists have really made out the existence not only of a great evil, but of one which grows and tends to grow with the growth of population and wealth. It must be said, however, that society has never yet used the means which are already in its power of grappling with this evil. The laws against

commercial frauds are very defective, and their execution still more so. Laws of this description have no chance of being really enforced unless it is the special duty of some one to enforce them. They are specially in need of a public prosecutor. It is still to be discovered how far it is possible to repress by means of the criminal law a class of misdeeds which are now seldom brought before the tribunals, and to which, when brought, the judicial administration of this country is most unduly lenient. The most important class, however, of these frauds, to the mass of the people, those which affect the price or quality of articles of daily consumption, can be in a great measure overcome by the institution of co-operative stores. By this plan any body of consumers who form themselves into an association for the purpose, are enabled to pass over the retail dealers and obtain their articles direct from the wholesale merchants, or, what is better (now that wholesale co-operative agencies have been established), from the producers, thus freeing themselves from the heavy tax now paid to the distributing classes and at the same time eliminate the usual perpetrators of adulterations and other frauds. Distribution thus becomes a work performed by agents selected and paid by those who have no interest in anything but the cheapness and goodness of the article; and the distributors are capable of being thus reduced to the numbers which the quantity of work to be done really requires. The difficulties of the plan consist in the skill and trustworthiness required in the managers, and the imperfect nature of the control which can be exercised over them by the body at large. The great success and rapid growth of the system prove, however, that these difficulties are, in some tolerable degree, overcome. At all events, if the beneficial tendency of the competition of retailers in promoting cheapness is foregone, and has to be replaced by other securities, the mischievous tendency of the same competition in deteriorating quality is at any rate got rid of; and the prosperity of the co-operative stores shows that this benefit is obtained not only without detriment to cheapness, but with great advantage to it, since the profits of the concerns enable them to return to the consumers a large percentage on the price of every article supplied to them. So far, therefore, as this class of evils is concerned, an effectual remedy is already in operation, which, though suggested by and partly grounded on socialistic principles, is consistent with the existing constitution of property.

With regard to those greater and more conspicuous economical frauds, or malpractices equivalent to frauds, of which so many deplorable cases have become notorious—committed by merchants and bankers between themselves or between them and those who have trusted them with money, such a remedy as above described is not available, and the only resources which the present constitution

of society affords against them are a sterner reprobation by opinion, and a more efficient repression by the law. Neither of these remedies has had any approach to an effectual trial. It is on the occurrence of insolvencies that these dishonest practices usually come to light; the perpetrators take their place, not in the class of malefactors, but in that of insolvent debtors; and the laws of this and other countries were formerly so savage against simple insolvency, that by one of those reactions to which the opinions of mankind are liable, insolvents came to be regarded mainly as objects of compassion, and it seemed to be thought that the hand both of law and of public opinion could hardly press too lightly upon them. By an error in a contrary direction to the ordinary one of our law, which in the punishment of offences in general wholly neglects the question of reparation to the sufferer, our bankruptcy laws have for some time treated the recovery for creditors of what is left of their property as almost the sole object, scarcely any importance being attached to the punishment of the bankrupt for any misconduct which does not directly interfere with that primary purpose. For three or four years past there has been a slight counter-reaction, and more than one bankruptcy act has been passed, somewhat less indulgent to the bankrupt; but the primary object regarded has still been the pecuniary interest of the creditors, and criminality in the bankrupt himself, with the exception of a small number of well-marked offences, gets off almost with impunity. It may be confidently affirmed, therefore, that, at least in this country, society has not exerted the power it possesses of making mercantile dishonesty dangerous to the perpetrator. On the contrary, it is a gambling trick in which all the advantage is on the side of the trickster: if the trick succeeds it makes his fortune, or preserves it; if it fails, he is at most reduced to poverty, which was perhaps already impending when he determined to run the chance, and he is classed by those who have not looked closely into the matter, and even by many who have, not among the infamous but among the unfortunate. Until a more moral and rational mode of dealing with culpable insolvency has been tried and failed, commercial dishonesty cannot be ranked among evils the prevalence of which is inseparable from commercial competition.

Another point on which there is much misapprehension on the part of Socialists, as well as of Trades Unionists and other partisans of Labour against Capital, relates to the proportions in which the produce of the country is really shared and the amount of what is actually diverted from those who produce it, to enrich other persons. I forbear for the present to speak of the land, which is a subject apart. But with respect to capital employed in business, there is in the popular notions a great deal of illusion. When, for instance, a

capitalist invests £20,000 in his business, and draws from it an income of (suppose) £2,000 a year, the common impression is as if he was the beneficial owner both of the £20,000 and of the £2,000, while the labourers own nothing but their wages. The truth, however, is that he only obtains the £2,000 on condition of applying no part of the £20,000 to his own use. He has the legal control over it, and might squander it if he chose, but if he did he would not have the £2,000 a year also. As long as he derives an income from his capital he has not the option of withholding it from the use of others. As much of his invested capital as consists of buildings, machinery, and other instruments of production, are applied to production and are not applicable to the support or enjoyment of any one. What is so applicable (including what is laid out in keeping up or renewing the buildings and instruments) is paid away to labourers, forming their remuneration and their share in the division of the produce. For all personal purposes they have the capital and he has but the profits, which it only yields to him on condition that the capital itself is employed in satisfying not his own wants, but those of labourers. The proportion which the profits of capital usually bear to the capital itself (or rather to the circulating portion of it) is the ratio which the capitalist's share of the produce bears to the aggregate share of the labourers. Even of his own share a small part only belongs to him as the owner of capital. The portion of the produce which falls to capital merely as capital is measured by the interest of money, since that is all that the owner of capital obtains when he contributes nothing to production except the capital itself. Now the interest of capital in the public funds, which are considered to be the best security, is at the present prices (which have not varied much for many years) about three and one-third per cent. Even in this investment there is some little risk—risk of repudiation, risk of being obliged to sell out at a low price in some commercial crisis.

Estimating these risks at  $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent., the remaining 3 per cent. may be considered as the remuneration of capital, apart from insurance against loss. On the security of a mortgage 4 per cent. is generally obtained, but in this transaction there are considerably greater risks—the uncertainty of titles to land under our bad system of law; the chance of having to realise the security at a great cost in law charges; and liability to delay in the receipt of the interest, even when the principal is safe. When mere money independently of exertion yields a larger income, as it sometimes does, for example, by shares in railway or other companies, the surplus is hardly ever an equivalent for the risk of losing the whole, or part, of the capital by mismanagement, as in the case of the Brighton Railway, the dividend of which, after having been 6 per cent. per

annum, sunk to from nothing to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., and shares which had been bought at 120 could not be sold for more than about 43. When money is lent at the high rates of interest one occasionally hears of, rates only given by spendthrifts and needy persons, it is because the risk of loss is so great that few who possess money can be induced to lend to them at all. So little reason is there for the outcry against "usury" as one of the grievous burthens of the working classes. Of the profits, therefore, which a manufacturer or other person in business obtains from his capital no more than about 3 per cent. can be set down to the capital itself. If he were able and willing to give up the whole of this to his labourers, who already share among them the whole of his capital as it is annually reproduced from year to year, the addition to their weekly wages would be inconsiderable. Of what he obtains beyond 3 per cent. a great part is insurance against the manifold losses he is exposed to, and cannot safely be applied to his own use, but requires to be kept in reserve to cover those losses when they occur. The remainder is properly the remuneration of his skill and industry—the wages of his labour of superintendence. No doubt if he is very successful in business these wages of his are extremely liberal, and quite out of proportion to what the same skill and industry would command if offered for hire. But, on the other hand, he runs a worse risk than that of being out of employment; that of doing the work without earning anything by it, of having the labour and anxiety without the wages. I do not say that the drawbacks balance the privileges, or that he derives no advantage from the position which makes him a capitalist and employer of labour, instead of a skilled superintendent letting out his services to others; but the amount of his advantage must not be estimated by the great prizes alone. If we subtract from the gains of some the losses of others, and deduct from the balance a fair compensation for the anxiety, skill, and labour of both, grounded on the market price of skilled superintendence, what remains will be, no doubt, considerable, but yet, when compared to the entire capital of the country, annually reproduced and dispensed in wages, it is very much smaller than it appears to the popular imagination; and were the whole of it added to the share of the labourers it would make a less addition to that share than would be made by any important invention in machinery, or by the suppression of unnecessary distributors and other "parasites of industry." To complete the estimate, however, of the portion of the produce of industry which goes to remunerate capital we must not stop at the interest earned out of the produce by the capital actually employed in producing it, but must include that which is paid to the former owners of capital which has been unproductively spent and no longer exists, and is paid, of course, out of the produce of other

capital. Of this nature is the interest of national debts, which is the cost a nation is burthened with for past difficulties and dangers, or for past folly or profligacy of its rulers, more or less shared by the nation itself. To this must be added the interest on the debts of landowners and other unproductive consumers; except so far as the money borrowed may have been spent in remunerative improvement of the productive powers of the land. As for landed property itself—the appropriation of the rent of land by private individuals—I reserve, as I have said, this question for discussion hereafter; for the tenure of land might be varied in any manner considered desirable, all the land might be declared the property of the State, without interfering with the right of property in anything which is the product of human labour and abstinence.

It seemed desirable to begin the discussion of the Socialist question by these remarks in abatement of Socialist exaggerations, in order that the true issues between Socialism and the existing state of society might be correctly conceived. The present system is not, as many Socialists believe, hurrying us into a state of general indigence and slavery from which only Socialism can save us. The evils and injustices suffered under the present system are great, but they are not increasing; on the contrary, the general tendency is towards their slow diminution. Moreover the inequalities in the distribution of the produce between capital and labour, however they may shock the feeling of natural justice, would not by their mere equalisation afford by any means so large a fund for raising the lower levels of remuneration as Socialists, and many besides Socialists, are apt to suppose. There is not any one abuse or injustice now prevailing in society by merely abolishing which the human race would pass out of suffering into happiness. What is incumbent on us is a calm comparison between two different systems of society, with a view of determining which of them affords the greatest resources for overcoming the inevitable difficulties of life. And if we find the answer to this question more difficult, and more dependent upon intellectual and moral conditions, than is usually thought, it is satisfactory to reflect that there is time before us for the question to work itself out on an experimental scale, by actual trial. I believe we shall find that no other test is possible of the practicability or beneficial operation of Socialist arrangements; but that the intellectual and moral grounds of Socialism deserve the most attentive study, as affording in many cases the guiding principles of the improvements necessary to give the present economic system of society its best chance.

*(To be concluded in the next Number.)*

## AN AMERICAN VIEW OF AMERICAN COMPETITION.

THE competition between the United States and the manufacturing nations of Europe, and especially Great Britain, for the leading places in supplying with machine-made fabrics those nations that do not yet use modern machinery is a subject that just now excites great interest. It is not only important in reference to the peculiar circumstances of the present time, but much more important when we consider the momentous consequences that might follow the establishment on the part of the United States of a permanent manufacturing supremacy. If any such permanent change is indicated by existing circumstances, the cause for it must be looked for in radical and important differences in the competing nations, and not in any temporary and abnormal circumstances peculiar to the present time.

It is some of these permanent differences which we will more especially consider in the present paper. In comparing our power to compete with England we may claim advantages of one kind, and with the nations of Continental Europe advantages of another, in some respects of a different order. In competition with England it is often claimed that our chief advantage lies in a certain alleged versatility and power of adapting means to ends, and in great quickness of perception on the part of working people in respect to the advantages to be gained by the adoption of new processes or inventions. If we have this advantage, there must be special causes for it in the influences that are brought to bear upon the operatives and artisans who do the work, for a very large portion of them are foreign-born or are the children of foreign immigrants. Why should they work with any more zeal or judgment here than in the countries whence they have come? Why are Irish and French Canadian factory hands to be relied on for more steady work, larger product, better discipline, and more cleanly and wholesome conditions of life, than the operatives of England, Belgium, and Germany? To the writer it appears evident that these advantages, so far as they exist, are due mainly to the following circumstances—

First. Our system of common and purely secular schools, attended by the children of rich and poor alike.

Second. Manhood Suffrage.

Third. The easy acquisition of land.

Fourth. The habit of saving small sums induced by the establishment of Savings Banks throughout the manufacturing States.

Fifth. The absence of a standing army and the application of the revenue derived from taxes on the whole to useful purposes.



In respect to the first of these influences, the public school system, the foreign observer generally takes notice only of the quality of the instruction given, and though he may find something to praise, he finds also much to criticise; he finds in many cases the instruction bad and the subjects often ill-chosen, and he wonders at the misdirection of a force that might be so much more wisely applied. What he fails to notice is that the school itself, entirely apart from its instruction, is the great educator of the children who attend it. The school is, first of all, no respecter of persons; the stupid son of a rich man led in every class by the son of a mechanic cannot in after life look down on him as an inferior, whatever the conventional position of the two may be. Or if the rich man's son have brains as well as fortune, the poor man's son can never attribute to fortune only the lead that he may take in after life. The school is thoroughly democratic, and each pupil learns in it that it depends on himself alone what place he may take in after life, and that although society may be divided into planes, there is no system of caste and no barrier in the way of social success, except the want of character and ability to attain it. The associations of the common school utterly prevent anything like servility in the relation of classes in after life, and although it is sometimes made a little too manifest that "one man is as good as another, and a little better," on the part of those who are more eager than discreet in their effort to rise, yet on the whole the relation of the various classes which must in the nature of things always and everywhere exist, is that of mutual respect, and anything like the old-world distinctions of caste and rank would seem about as absurd to one as to the other. The common school is the solvent of race, creed, nationality, and condition.

Americans note with amazement the difficulties which occur in England on sectarian grounds in the establishment of secular schools. The school committees with us are apt to include members of every denomination, and usually the clergymen of each denomination serve their turn. In the town where the present writer lives there are about eleven hundred pupils in the free schools which are supervised by a committee of nine members. On the present committee are the clergymen of the Unitarian, Episcopal, and Swedenborgian societies, and among the lay members are members of the Orthodox, Baptist, and Catholic Societies. The absence of sectarian prejudice was lately illustrated in a notable way in St. Louis, Missouri. One of the principal Baptist churches was burned; the next day the pastor received offers from eight Christian congregations of several denominations to use their churches half of each Sunday, but all these were declined in favour of the offer of the Jews, whose Rabbi urged the use of their synagogue on the ground that his own congregation did not need it on Sunday at all; and in the Jewish Syna-

gogue, on the following Sunday and since, the worship of the God of Jew and Gentile has been conducted under Christian forms.

In another way the discipline of the schools affects the processes of manufacture. In the schools, cleanliness, order, and regular habits are enforced, with deference to the teachers and respect for authority; and in these later years coupled with the teaching of music and drawing in all the principal towns and cities. When children thus trained are removed to the mill or the workshop, habits of order and cleanliness, with some æsthetic taste, are already established. Nothing strikes an American manufacturer with so much surprise as the extreme untidiness of the large textile mills of England, and the dreariness of the factory towns. In this respect, however, it must be confessed that the managers of the New England mills are greatly aided by the absence of smoke, the coal commonly used being anthracite. Much surprise is often expressed by our foreign visitors at the amount of decoration permitted in the fitting of stationary and locomotive engines, and in much of our machinery, but bad as the taste displayed may sometimes be, it is nevertheless a fact that such engines or machines are better cared for and kept in better repair than where no individuality, so to speak, is permitted. On one of our great railways the attempt was not long since made to dispatch the locomotives as they happened to arrive at the central station, sometimes with one, and sometimes with another engine-driver; but the immediate and great increase in the repair account caused the corporation to return very soon to the customary plan of giving each driver his own locomotive with which he may be identified.

The instruction of the school also gives every pupil a superficial knowledge, if no more, of the geography and resources of the country, which the universal habit of reading newspapers keeps up. Hence comes the almost entire absence of any fixed character in the labour of the country—every boy believes that he can achieve success somewhere else if not at home. No congestion of labour can last long—the war and the succeeding railway mania combined concentrated population at certain points to a greater extent than ever happened before, and it has taken five years to overcome the difficulty; but within these five years a million new inhabitants in Texas, half a million in Kansas, and probably a million and a half added to the population of Nebraska, Colorado, Minnesota, and the far north-west indicate that the evil has already found a remedy.

It is already apparent that a very slight increase in the demand for skilled workmen in certain branches of employment would not easily be met in the eastern states except by drawing upon England and Germany. During the years of depression the cessation of railway building, and the use of the excess of railway plant existing in 1873, has caused the dispersion of a large portion of the trained

mechanics and artizans who then did the work of supplying this demand; but these are not the men who have crowded the eastern cities and caused the apparent excess of labourers out of work—such men have gone back to the land, or in the new States and territories have found other ways in which to apply their skill and energy, and they will not return. It may be that the greatest danger to the manufacturers of England will not be in our competition in the sale of goods in neutral markets, but in our competition for the skilled workmen and artizans who make these goods, when we again offer them equal or higher wages and better conditions of life in the work that will very soon need to be done to supply the increasing demand in our own country.

The Patent system may here be cited also as a factor in our industrial system. It has been carried to an almost absurd extreme, so that it is not safe for any one to adopt a new method, machine or part of a machine, and attempt to use it quietly and without taking out a patent, lest some sharp person seeing it in use and not published, shall himself secure a patent and come back to the real inventor with a claim for royalty.

Manhood suffrage, subject as it is to great abuses, and difficult as it has made the problem of the self-government of great cities where voters do not meet each other, as in the town meeting, face to face, but where the powers of government are of necessity delegated to men of whom the voters can have little personal knowledge, yet works distinctly in the direction of the safety, stability, and order of the community. Outside of two or three of the very largest cities, where there are concentrated great masses of illiterate *foreign-born* citizens, it would be difficult to find a case of serious abuse of the power of taxation except in the south since the war, where the evil is now mainly abated.

The writer of this paper lives in a small but very rich town, containing about seven thousand people, adjacent to a great city; in this town one half of the voters pay only a poll-tax, having no property of their own liable to taxation, and of the poll-tax payers, again, a very large portion, if not a majority, are of Irish birth or extraction. The town has been guilty of many acts of extravagance during these late years of delusive prosperity, and is burthened with a heavy debt; but not a single one of these acts of extravagance has ever originated with the poll-tax payers; they may have sustained such measures, but they have been led into them by men of property and influence. One-fourth part of the population of Massachusetts, the manufacturing state *par excellence*, are foreign-born, mostly Irish and French Canadians, yet nowhere is property more safe, state and municipal credit higher, or elections more orderly and more free from violence. To the man who thinks he can correct the abuses under which he suffers, or supposes that he suffers, by his ballot,

any other method seems beneath his dignity, and violent acts like the riots in Pennsylvania a year or two since excite little general uneasiness, because it is felt that there must have been, as indeed there were, special and local causes for them, even though such causes may not be positively or publicly defined.

The easy acquisition of land throughout the country under simple forms of conveyance registered in every county gives a motive to economy, and induces habits of saving that are of supreme importance in their effect on society. In the town to which the writer has referred,—and in which he himself can remember the coming of the first Irishman, who became a landowner,—out of about one thousand owners of real estate over two hundred are of Irish birth or extraction. The richest one among them came from Ireland in 1846, a steerage passenger. He now pays taxes on property of the value of fifty thousand dollars, almost all in real estate; his son is superintendent of the repairs of highways and one of the most efficient members of the school committee.

During the last thirty years the factory population of New England has passed through three phases. First came the sons and daughters of the New England farmer, but as the sewing-machine and other inventions opened new demands for women's work, women of American birth passed out to easier or better-paid employments, while the men took up other branches requiring more individual skill. Their places were taken mainly by Irish, with a few Germans and English; but the Irish saved their earnings, and as the New England yeomen emigrated to the richer lands of the great West, they passed out of the mills to buy up the deserted farms of the poorer North-eastern States, where by their persistent industry and manual labour they achieve success and gain a position which satisfies them, but with which the native New Englander is no longer contented. Their places in the mills are now being more and more taken by the French Canadians, who in their new conditions and surroundings show little of the stolid and unprogressive character which have kept them so long contented on their little strips of land on the St. Lawrence River. In the very air they breathe they seem to imbibe a new and restless energy, while the intelligence shown by their children in the schools augurs well for their future progress. On the whole, the simplicity of our system of land tenure, and the ease with which small parcels may be obtained, must be rated among the most important factors in considering our possible advantage over other countries.

Next in our list comes the savings-bank. In 1875, out of the 1,652,000 inhabitants of Massachusetts, 720,000 were depositors in savings-banks to the amount of 238,000,000 dollars (£49,000,000). During the late years of depression the deposit has decreased somewhat in amount, but the decrease has been chiefly owing to the

withdrawal of money for other investment, especially in United States bonds. There have been some failures of banks and some losses, as might well have been expected, but they have been less than in any other branch of business, and the savings-bank system stands firmly based on well-earned confidence, and offers an easy means of saving the smallest sums to every man, woman, and child in the State.

To these causes of quick adaptation to any conditions that may arise, or to any necessity for the application of new methods or devices, may be added the custom, which has almost the force of law, of an equal distribution of estates among the children of the testator. *Tools to him who can use them* is the unwritten law, and neither land nor capital can remain long in the possession of him who cannot direct or use them wisely. Liberty to distribute is esteemed as important a factor in our body politic as liberty to accumulate, even though the liberty may sometimes lead to the apparent waste of great fortunes.

Finally, it must be held that our freedom from the blood-tax of a standing army, and the fact that the proceeds of taxation are on the whole usefully and productively expended are among our greatest advantages, and this is asserted with confidence, notwithstanding the misgovernment of some great cities and of several of the southern States. What are these failures but proofs of the general confidence of the people in local self-government? Great frauds and great abuses can only happen where integrity is the common rule; where each man distrusts his neighbour, or each town, city, or State distrusts the next, the opportunity for fraud or breach of trust cannot occur. The use of inconvertible paper-money during late years has not been without its necessary malign result upon the character of the people, and the newspapers are filled with the fraud and corruption that have come to light, but no newspaper has ever yet recorded one fact that offsets many frauds. In the great Boston fire one of the Boston banks lost, not only every book of account, but every security and note that was in its vaults, amounting to over twelve hundred and fifty thousand dollars. On the morning after the fire its officers had no evidence or record by which any of the persons or corporators who owed it money could be held to their contracts, yet within a very short time duplicate notes were voluntarily brought in by its debtors, many of whom knew not whether they could ever pay them, because the fire had destroyed their own property, and the ultimate loss of that bank from the burning of its books and securities was less than ten thousand dollars.

Our army is but a border police, and although its officers are held in honour and esteem, military life is not a career that very many seek, and as time goes on it will become less and less an occupation to be desired. Although officers of the army have several times been

the candidates whom political parties have found it expedient to adopt for the highest executive offices, army influence in legislation has been very slight, and any attempt to increase it is more a cause of jealousy and suspicion than of favour. If the Indian question were not at once the shame of all our past administrations, and the problem most difficult of solution among all that are now pressing upon us, it is doubtful if our army would consist of more than its corps of trained officers with a few soldiers to keep our useless old forts in repair. Thus we are spared not only the tax for its support, but the worse tax of the withdrawal of its members from useful and productive pursuits. It is in this respect that we claim our greatest advantage over the nations of Continental Europe. What have we to fear from the competition of Germany, if we really undertake to beat her in the neutral markets which we can reach as readily as she can? For a little while the better instruction of her merchants in her technical and commercial schools may give her advantage, but that can be overcome in a single generation, or as soon as the need is felt with us, as it is now beginning to be felt; after we shall have supplied our present want of technical education, the mere difference between the presence of her great army on her soil and its necessary support, and the absence of such a tax on us, will constitute the difference on which modern commerce turns, when the traffic of the world turns on half a cent a yard, a cent a bushel, or a halfpenny a pound on the great staples; no nation can long succeed in holding the traffic that is handicapped with a standing army. The protection of Germany from our competition in neutral markets may be offset in our yet more dangerous competition for men. The German already knows Texas, and in the one block of 60,000 square miles of land by which the State of Texas exceeds the area of the German Empire, we offer room and healthy conditions of life for millions of immigrants, and on that single square of land if they come in sufficient numbers they can raise as much cotton as is now raised in the whole south, that is to say, 5,000,000 bales, and as much wheat as is now raised in the whole north, that is to say, 400,000,000 bushels, and yet subsist themselves besides on what is left of this little patch that will not be needed for these two crops.

It will be obvious that even the least imaginative cannot but be moved by the influences that have been designated, and that versatility and readiness to adopt every labour-saving device will not only be promoted, but absolutely forced into action when such vast areas are to be occupied, and when even the duller boy is educated in the belief that he also is to be one of those who are to build up this nation to the full measure of its high calling. We may not dare to boast in view of all we have passed through, but we know that slavery has been destroyed, and that the nation lives stronger, truer, and more vigorous than ever before. We know that it has been

reserved for a Democratic Republic to be the first among nations that, having issued government notes and made them legal tender, has resumed payment in coin without repudiation or reduction of the promise. We know that we have paid a third of our great national debt already, and that the rest is now mainly held by our own citizens. We know that within the lives of men of middle age now living the nation will number one hundred millions, and that in whatever else we may be found wanting, we cannot long be kept back in our career of material prosperity, which shall be shared with absolute certainty by every one who brings to the work health, integrity, and energy.

If there is any force in this reasoning, our competition with other manufacturing countries in supplying neutral markets with manufactured goods will not be compassed by low rates of wages paid to our factory operatives or to the working people engaged in our metal works and other occupations, but first by obtaining and keeping such an advanced position in the application and use of improved tools and machinery as shall make high wages consistent with a low cost of production; secondly, by our ability to obtain the raw materials at as low or lower cost. Every employer knows that among employ  es who are paid by the piece, it is the operative that gains the largest earnings whose production costs the least, because under the control of such operatives the machinery is most effectively guided during working hours. As it is with single operatives, so is it with large masses—if well instructed and working under the incentives to industry and frugality that have been named, their large product will earn for them ample wages, and yet result in low cost of labour to the employer. Such workmen never have any “blue Monday.” The workman who in this country habitually becomes intoxicated is soon discharged, and his place is filled by one who respects himself and values his place too much to risk his position in dissipation.

Competition with England in supplying the markets of Asia, Africa, and South America with cotton goods is now perhaps the best criterion by which to gauge our ability to compete in other branches of manufacture. It has been often assumed in England that the increasing shipments of cotton goods from this country have been forced by necessity, and merely consisted of lots sold below cost as a means of obtaining ready money; but there is no ground whatever for this general assumption, even though some small shipments may have been made at first with this view. Our export of cotton fabrics amounts as yet to but seven or eight per cent. of our production, and is but a trifle compared to that of Great Britain; but it is not made at a loss, and it constitutes a most important element in the returning prosperity of our cotton mills. The goods exported are

mostly made by strong and prosperous corporations, paying regular dividends. They consist mainly of coarse sheetings and drills, and are sold by the manufacturers to merchants, who send them to China, Africa, and South America in payment for tea, silk, ivory, sugar, gums, hides, and wool. They are not made by operatives who earn less than the recent or present rates of wages in England, but in most departments of the mills by those who earn as much or more. This competition had been fairly begun before the late war in this country, but it is now continued under better conditions. The mills of New England are now relatively much nearer the cotton fields than they were then, owing to through connections by rail. Prior to 1860 substantially all the cotton went to the seaports of the cotton States, and from there the cost of moving it to the North or to Liverpool varied but little; but at the present day a large and annually increasing portion of the cotton used in the North is bought in the interior markets and carried in covered cars directly to the mills, where the bales are delivered clean, and much more free from damage and waste than those which are carried down the Southern rivers on boats and barges, dumped upon the wharves, and then compressed to the utmost for shipment by sea.

And since large and increasing quantities of cotton are not only taking the inland routes by rail for use in Northern mills, but also for shipment to Liverpool from New York and Boston, it must be in the nature of things that those who buy in New York and Boston will have an advantage in price about equal to the cost of shipment to England, with insurance and other necessary charges included. This advantage cannot be less than a farthing or half-cent per pound, and the factory that uses cotton in the manufacture of coarse and medium goods, such as are wanted in the markets named, at half a cent a pound advantage in the price, can pay twenty per cent. higher wages and yet land the goods, other things being equal, in neutral markets at the same cost with its foreign competitors who pay the higher price for cotton.

Again, in one of the largest mills in this country, more than one-half of whose products now go to China and Africa, the improvements and changes in machinery since 1860 have given the following result:—In 1860 the average year's product of one operative was 5,317 lbs. of cloth, and the average earnings of women in the mill were \$3.26 per week. In 1878 the average year's product was 7,923 lbs. cloth, and the average of women's earnings \$4.34 per week. It may also be considered that the gold dollar of 1878 will buy 15 to 20 per cent. more of the commodities in common use than the gold dollar of 1860. In that factory the average year's work of one operative will give about 1,600 Chinamen 5 lbs. or 16 yards each of cotton drill, and the entire cost of labour in making the drill, including all payments made, from the agent who controls the



factory down to the scrub who washes the floor, is about one and a quarter cents a yard.

This includes the cost of stamping and packing, the custom of this country being to conduct all the processes of manufacture and the preparation of the cloth for the market in the same establishment. The standard printing cloth, twenty-eight inches wide, the fabric more largely produced than any other, is made at a labour cost of less than one cent a yard, including also all the salaries and wages paid and the cost of packing. It will therefore be apparent that the reason why our exports of manufactured cotton, and for similar reasons of other goods and wares, do not increase more rapidly, is not to be found in any excess of cost or in any fault in quality, but in the simple fact that during the fifteen years of war, inflation, railway mania, and municipal extravagance that preceded the hard times from which we are just emerging, little or no attention was or could be paid to foreign markets, and the very habit of foreign commerce was lost. The ways and means of commerce cannot be improvised in a year, or in five years, but the foundations have lately been laid, and our competition may soon become even more serious than it now is, unless the increasing demand of our home markets for the products of our mills shall again absorb all that we can make. Whether or not we are ready to build mills of any kind for the purpose of supplying foreign markets is a question that the future only can determine.

It may here be proper to say that perhaps the migration of industrial centres, so ably treated in a recent number of the *Fortnightly Review*,<sup>1</sup> is not to be either promoted or prevented by the possession of great deposits of coal and iron. May it not be true that as less and less power is required, as machinery is simplified and made to run with less friction, and as improvements are made in the combustion of coal to the utilisation of a larger portion of the force contained in each ton, the mere proximity of coal and iron, and the mere possession of these crude forces will not suffice, but that the control of great branches of industry will depend on what may be called finer points. It is not very many years since a young man came to New England from the far west to visit the works where ploughs were made: he told the New England craftsmen that they did not fully understand the nature of the prairie soil, that they had not calculated the true curves of least resistance, and that he intended to establish a plough factory on the Mississippi. They did not much fear his competition, but now his great factory, employing hundreds of workmen, furnishes ploughs even for Eastern use.

The recent period of depression has taught the lesson of economy in all manufactures, and the northern or manufacturing states are just ready to begin work under the conditions of a sound currency

(1) See *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1878.

and a system of taxation which, though yet onerous and unfit in many ways, is but a light burthen compared to what it has been. The country is fairly launched upon the discussion of economic questions, a discussion which will not end until the system of national taxation best fitted to our new conditions shall have been adopted. Our friends abroad must not expect great and revolutionary changes in the matter of taxation. No oppressive duty on food compels action, and there are no advocates for rash or rapid changes. Whether right or wrong in principle, our system now in force was adopted to meet the emergency of war, and our industry has been more or less moulded by and to it. Almost all sources of direct taxation are absorbed by the States as their own sources of revenue, and the national revenue must of necessity be drawn mainly from duties upon imports. It would seem that the experience of nations during the last five years has proved that neither protection nor free trade have availed much to prevent disaster, and perhaps from this conviction it now happens that there is less discussion on these disputed theories than there was ten years since, but rather an earnest desire on the part of almost all men, whatever their convictions may be, that contention shall be avoided, and that whenever the reform of our war tariff is fairly undertaken, it shall be entered upon with care and deliberation, and proceed with as much regard to caution in making changes as was had in England in the conduct of the great reforms begun in 1842 under the sagacious leadership of Sir Robert Peel.

It may also be well for our English friends to consider that according to their present theory the removal of duties on imports enabled them to manufacture at less cost and greatly enlarged their markets. If such was the effect of the gradual and cautious method of change adopted at the instance of Sir Robert Peel, and first applied to the materials which entered into the processes of English manufacture, what might be the effect of the same method in our case? If we begin by abating the duties on materials, while moderately reducing those on finished products which must be kept at a revenue point in almost any case, may not our competition become greater rather than less? If it is becoming serious while we are handicapped according to the English theory by a very high war tariff, what may it be when by common consent without contention it is modified and reduced in a judicious way, and one carefully considered so as not to cause disaster by too radical changes? That such must be the method of change all are now agreed, to whatever school they belong.

In reading articles written in England regarding the effect of tariff legislation in the United States, it frequently appears to be the opinion of the writers that the people of this country have made a mistake in undertaking any branch of manufacturing industry, and

that they would have been much more prosperous had they confined their attention mainly to agriculture ; conversely that the manufactures of the United States would cease to exist if they were not sustained by a very high and in many respects prohibitive tariff. An example of this method of reasoning is found in the reprint of a series of otherwise very able articles by Mr. A. J. Wilson, under the title of the *Resources of Foreign Countries*. Mr. Wilson says : "There is no use in denying the plain fact that the States have succeeded by their high-tariff policy in diverting a considerable part of the industrial energies of the community from the pursuits natural to, and most profitable in, a new country, to the highly artificial, and, for America, mostly very expensive industries of long-settled and civilised nations. Were the sheltering tariff swept away, it is very questionable if any, save a few special manufactures of certain kinds of tools, machinery, railway cars and fancy goods, and a few of the cruder manufactures, could maintain their ground."

It probably escaped Mr. Wilson's notice that a nation that had passed through a popular national election under the most exciting conditions possible, such as the last election of President, without an act of violence in the whole land, had a sort of claim to be called civilised ; but apart from this unconscious slip of the pen the whole assumption may be questioned. The fallacy lies in the common unthinking habit of confining the term manufactures to the product of great textile factories, iron mills, and metal works. It is not even necessary to remind writers as able as Mr. Wilson that the war of the Revolution was greatly promoted by the attempt of Great Britain to prevent the establishment of iron and steel works and manufactures of wool in the American colonies ; but we may admit that if the sheltering tariff were suddenly swept away, great disaster might ensue to special branches of industry that have undoubtedly been developed or promoted by its enactment. Even then the vast proportion of our manufactures would remain unimpaired, and the industries harmed by "sweeping" changes such as not even the most pronounced believers in ultimate free trade would now dream of proposing, could only be retarded in their development. It cannot be assumed by any observant man that our vast fields of adjacent coal and iron could long remain unused. Even in these last three or four years of extreme depression, a large number of new furnaces have been constructed and put in blast in the Hocking Valley of Ohio, and the production of the best iron is increasing with great rapidity at that point. Neither can it be assumed that with our advantage of position in respect to the production of cotton and food, we could be prevented from at least manufacturing the coarse and medium goods that constitute far more than one-half of the world's demand for cotton fabrics ; or that a people whose ancestors

had clothed themselves in homespun woollen cloth, could long be prevented from applying machinery to at least the common fabrics that serve the purposes of the million.

Apart even from these special branches, we should surely retain our work in steel wares, for which we even now import a part of the raw material, and yet send the finished product back to Sheffield to be sold; we should retain our great manufacture of leather and all its products; of iron wares of every name and nature; of all the products of wood in which we excel; of all the tools and machinery of agriculture and of the railway service; of all the fittings for the building of houses; of clothing, of carriages and waggons; in short, of all the lesser branches of manufacturing and mechanical industry which may not impose upon the imagination by the magnitude of the buildings in which they are conducted, but yet give employment to millions where the operatives in the special branches to which the term manufactures is apt to be limited can be counted only by hundreds of thousands. The time has gone by for anyone to dream of relegating the people of this country to the single pursuit of agriculture under any possible policy, or even to the crude forms of manufacture. Foreign nations can never again supply us with any large proportion of the staple goods or wares that constitute the principal part of our use of manufactured articles. Goods which depend upon fashion, fancy, and style, and articles of comfort or luxury that we can afford to buy abroad, we shall import in ever-increasing quantities as our means of payment increase with our returning prosperity, and we shall, doubtless, continue to collect a large revenue from them. It may also be considered that the repugnance to direct taxation is so great that even if it were generally admitted that indirect taxation was much more costly, the majority of the people would still choose to indulge in the luxury of the indirect method, and can afford to do so if they so choose.

It is beginning to be perceived that not only the great moral curse of slavery has been removed, but that in that removal perhaps the greatest industrial revolution ever accomplished has happened. Whatever may have been the abuses of the ballot granted to the negro up to this time, it has yet so far protected him that the incentive to labour has not been wanting, and the mere fact that the last eight crops of cotton raised by free labour exceed the nine ante-war crops of slavery is alone proof sufficient of the advance in the production of wealth that has already ensued. Reference has already been made to the rapid progress of Texas, but Georgia invites the immigrant to easier conditions of life. The upper pine lands of the great State are now to be bought by the hundred thousand acres at half a dollar to a dollar an acre, the true country for the abundant production of wool where no winter shelter for

sheep is needed and where all the conditions of health exist. The almost unknown valleys that lie between the Blue Ridge and the lateral ranges of Virginia and North Carolina offer homes for hardy men, nearer the centre of civilization than the far west, but passed by until now because of the curse of slavery. If the well-trained tenant farmers of Great Britain who are now surrendering their farms should turn their attention to the opportunities offered in many parts of Virginia, they would find that it needs only brains and industry to put that great State once more on the list among the rich and prosperous communities. Land can be bought in fee simple for a fraction of the annual rent of an English farm, while its proximity to the north gives assurance of ready markets for its products.

May it not perhaps be in the order of events that our competition with England in supplying neutral markets with manufactured goods, will be warded off by the home demand on our mills and workshops to supply the needs of one of the great tidal waves of population that seems about to be directed upon our shores from foreign lands, and that this great cycle of change, which began in our war of 1861, will be ended upon the same soil by the incursion of a great industrial army devoted to the arts of peace to whom that war has opened the way by destroying slavery. When this country was cursed by slavery it was natural that those who boasted at all should boast too much of our alleged greatness, while those who like a great Southern statesman then "dreaded the future of our country when they remembered that God was just," kept silent. Now we make no boast, but only mark the fact that even abundance may cease to be a blessing when it cannot reach those who need it. We are seeking to cure evils that war had left behind, and now that we stand once more upon the firm ground of a sound currency and feel that we have learned the true lesson of economy and thrift, we look with sadness at the distress in other lands and hope that we may help to remove it.

EDWARD ATKINSON.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS,  
*January, 1879.*

## THOMAS PAINE.

DURING the International Exposition at Philadelphia, by which the hundredth year of American independence was celebrated, a number of eminent citizens of the United States presented to that city a bust of Thomas Paine. The offer was promptly declined. After a century of progress in a republic founded in religious freedom by freethinkers the *odium theologicum* was still strong enough, when the list of revolutionary heroes was unrolled for national homage, to single out for insult the man who in the year commemorated was idolised beyond all others, above even Washington himself. A recent writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* remarks that "his (Paine's) career was wonderful, even for the age of miraculous events he lived in." This is literally true, but one may now add that even the wonders of his career while living are eclipsed by those which have attended his name and fame. It would be impossible to find in the eighteenth century a name surrounded with brighter halo by those of his contemporaries whom the world now honours; it would be equally impossible to find in the nineteenth century a name more covered with obloquy. Nor is this obloquy found in theological quarters alone. There is a purely mythological Paine still industriously circulated in pictorial tracts, which show him recanting his opinions, and dying "in fear and agony, frightened by the clanking chains of devils—in fact, frightened to death by God." But there is also a conventionalised Paine whose actuality is admitted even by scholars, and who is denied a place of honour among independent minds as contemptuously as the bust was refused a niche in the Independence Hall at Philadelphia.

At a time when even such a liberal thinker as Mr. Leslie Stephen is found contributing his assent to the *schwärmerei* of traditions and denunciations gathered around the reputation of Paine, an attempt to secure a rehearing of his case may meet little favour. Many of the unorthodox may properly repudiate anything looking like an admission that the works or character of Paine form any part of their case. What matters it if he was a lax thinker, an ignorant, tipsy vagabond? *Concessum sit*. His writings are of no importance to our questions, his political opinions and deeds have no relation to present emergencies. But even conceding this, it may be claimed that the man whom, above all others, theological hatred has distinguished by the persistency of its invective has some title to the consideration of a tolerant age; and further, that polemical writings which elicited more volumes in reply from eminent theologians than any others of their time can hardly be without historical interest, if

no other. However, I am induced to submit the present study not by any desire to vindicate Paine's opinions, nor even primarily to vindicate Paine himself, but by a conviction that beneath the conventionalised and vulgarised notion of this man lies obscured a remarkable chapter of modern history, and altogether hidden one of the best types of English mind and character.

The pious mythology that has gathered around Paine may be briefly dismissed. All the morning-stars become rebellious and diabolical Lucifers to those on whose darkness they bring the light. The light which Paine brought upon the bald dogmas of a hundred years ago has so far faded to the light of common day, that many who regard his name with abhorrence are nearer to him in belief than to those with whom their notions of the man originated. To such his reign of terror is generally explained by the theory that he must have been a blasphemer, and an atheist of an especially vulgar type. The late Lord Dalling, in his essay on Cobbett, speaks of Paine as "an atheist;" whereas his theism was pronounced and almost passionate. The Bishop of Llandaff, in replying to Paine, said, "There is a philosophical sublimity in some of your ideas when speaking of the Creator of the universe." It seems to have been part of the evidences of such Christianity as Paine opposed that its assailants should die in agony and terror. The same imagination that invented the horrors of Faust's end is, however, somewhat tempered in the sensational pulpit pictures of the death-beds of Voltaire and Paine; and all may be favourably contrasted with the realistic scenes attending the last moments of Bruno and some others which they succeeded. But in Paine's case an amusing solcism is presented in the twofold character of the myth, which equally insists that he recanted his heresies and was nevertheless carried off by devils. The denunciations which have pursued him have been directed against a man who is yet declared to have died in the true faith. In truth, poor Paine did have a hard time of it in his closing days. No sooner was it known that his end was near than fanatical preachers and women managed to gain entrance to his room and tried to convert him. To the ministers who told him that if he died without believing on the Lord Jesus Christ he would be damned, Paine replied, "Let me have none of your popish stuff. Good morning." A woman came saying that God had sent her to tell him that unless he repented and believed in the blessed Saviour he would be damned. Paine replied that God would not send a foolish old woman with such an impertinent message. One after another these obtrusive zealots were dismissed, and finally, in the words of his relentless enemy, Cheetham, "Thomas Paine died placidly, and almost without a struggle." In the year of his death, 1809, Paine wrote his will, at the close of which he says: "I have lived an honest

and useful life to mankind; my time has been spent in doing good; and I die in perfect composure and resignation to the will of my Creator, God."

In the biography of Cobbett, recently published,<sup>1</sup> there are several allusions to Paine, and the efforts made by Cobbett to repair the wrong he had done to the good name of Paine are indicated, though with less fulness than the facts admit of. While Paine was in France, amid revolutionary scenes and perils, there appeared in London *The Life of Thomas Paine, the Author of Rights of Man. By Francis Oldys, A.M., of the University of Pennsylvania. Printed for John Stockdale, Piccadilly, 1791.* Mr. Edward Smith justly characterises it as "one of the most horrible collections of abuse which even that venal day produced." It is now known to have been written by George Chalmers, who fled from America and became a Government clerk and pamphleteer in England. Paine probably did not see this libel until long after it was written. The malice displayed in every line, and its political animus, rendered a reply unnecessary; and the pamphlet was sinking into oblivion when William Cobbett reprinted it in his *Censor*. He lamented his mistake, and carried his desire to make reparation to the extent of bringing Paine's bones to England in hope that they might be entombed with honour. The welcome which Cobbett and Paine's bones received may be judged from the fact that the Bolton town-crier was imprisoned ten weeks for announcing their arrival. And now, sixty years later, for mere mention of these bones with honour, Cobbett's biographer has received a sentence of corresponding severity from a weekly reviewer, who, to the growing Paine-myth, adds the unique charge of venality!

There are several good biographies of Paine,—such are those written by Vale, Sherwin, Rickman, Linton,—yet in an important public library in London the only books concerning him are the political libel of George Chalmers and the pious libel of Cheetham, for which he was convicted in a court of Christians. Cheetham was a Manchester man who went to New York and edited a paper. No sooner had the grave closed over Paine than Cheetham, in the same year, published his accusations. The worst of these involved the honour of a lady, Madame Bonneville, who promptly prosecuted the accuser for slander; and though the judge reminded the jury that the defendant's book was calculated to aid Christianity, they brought in a verdict against him with damages. It is important, however, to state that the most eminent Christian writers in America were not deceived by these libels. Thus, the Rev. Solomon Southwick, editor of the *Christian Visitor* when Cheetham's book appeared, wrote: "Had Thomas Paine been guilty of any crime, we should be the last

(1) *The Life of William Cobbett.* By Edward Smith. (Sampson Low & Co.) . . .



to eulogise his memory. But we cannot find he was ever guilty of any other crime than that of advancing his opinions freely upon all subjects connected with public liberty and happiness. . . . We may safely affirm that Paine's conduct in America was that of a real patriot. In the French Convention he displayed the same pure and disinterested spirit. . . . His life, it is true, was written by a ministerial hireling, who strove in vain to blacken his moral character. The late James Cheetham likewise wrote his life, and we have no hesitation in saying that we knew perfectly well at the time the motives of that author for writing and publishing a work which, we have every reason to believe, is a libel almost from beginning to end. In fact, Cheetham had become tired of this country, and had formed a plan to return to England and become a ministerial editor in opposition to Cobbett, and his *Life of Paine* was written to pave his way back again."<sup>1</sup>

Although the authorities of Philadelphia have refused to admit the bust of Paine to a place in Independence Hall, his portrait is there, and it is near that of George III. This juxtaposition is proper enough. To these two men may be fairly ascribed the revolution and its event, of which Independence Hall is the historic memorial. It was at a time when those American leaders, from whose statuesque company Paine is rejected, sat in the same place anxious and dismayed, without any clear idea of whither the storm was bearing them and the country, that there appeared among them that Englishman and his Quaker coat who was the first to pronounce the word "Independence." Not for a long time after the struggle had begun, did the idea of complete separation from England enter the question. The leaders regarded themselves as resisting a special wrong; and at any time before Paine began his appeals the English Ministry might have ended the difficulty by conceding to the colonies immunity from certain taxes. There is even reason to believe that submission rather than separation was beginning to be the question in the minds of many influential Americans at the close of that dark year, 1774, when Paine arrived in America. "Independence was a doctrine scarce and rare even towards the conclusion of the year '75. All our politicks had been founded on the hope or expectation of making the matter up; a hope which, though general on the side of America, had never entered the head or heart of the British court."<sup>2</sup> On the 8th of July, 1775, the American Congress humbly petitioned the king "that your royal authority and influence may be graciously interposed to procure us relief from our

(1) *Testimonials, &c.*, compiled by J. N. Moreau. 1861.

(2) Crisis No. 3. Paine himself appears to have reached the conclusion that complete and final separation was necessary only after the battle at Concord and Lexington, April 19, 1775.—*Common Sense*, p. 28.

afflicting fears and jealousies, and to settle peace through every part of your dominions; with all humility submitting to your Majesty's wise consideration, whether it may not be expedient, for facilitating these important purposes, that your Majesty be pleased to direct some mode by which the united applications of your faithful colonists to the throne, may be improved into a happy and permanent reconciliation." <sup>1</sup> Mr. Penn, who carried this petition to England, presented it on the 1st of September in the same year, and on the 4th was informed by Lord Dartmouth that "no answer would be given to it;" and, although this haughty attitude induced the revolutionary leaders to listen more favourably to Paine's arguments, even then they persuaded him to strike out of his first pamphlet on the subject a sentence which seemed to burn their ships. The sentence crased from *Common Sense* was:—"A greater absurdity cannot be conceived of than three millions of people running to their sea-coast every time a ship arrived from London, to know what portion of liberty they should enjoy." <sup>2</sup>

It is probable that even Franklin, who introduced Paine to the chiefs of the revolution as a friend he had met in London, knew little of the moral region from which the man had come, or how much of England he bore with him. No individual of that time was more related to the feeling and convictions which stirred the genuine heart of the English people. He went from those humble clubs which had no constitutions, and met in public-houses or small rooms, wherein were uttered in the ear many things that have since been proclaimed from the housetops. One such circle was that which met at the White Hart in Lewes every evening. Its central figure was the exciseman, Thomas Paine (then about thirty years of age), who generally had in his possession the "Headstrong Book,"—an old volume of Homer which was delivered to the wrangler who most obstinately and successfully defended his position in an evening's debate. It would be not a little curious if, as Clio Rickman seems to think, it was while as yet Paine had no reputation beyond the village, that one of the White Hart company wrote verses to him such as the following:—

"Thy logic vanquished error, and thy mind  
No bounds but those of right and truth confined.  
Thy soul of fire must sure ascend the sky,  
Immortal Paine, thy fame can never die."

Paine was not then, indeed, a mere radical in the rough. His father (a stay-maker) was the son of a respectable Quaker farmer; his mother the daughter of a lawyer in Thetford, where Paine was born (1736), and they made sacrifices to secure him the best education within their reach. He studied well in the Thetford grammar-school, whose

(1) *Journals of Congress.*

(2) Rush's Letter, July 17, 1809.

master was the Rev. William Knowles; and, at any rate, he appears to have given satisfaction as teacher of English in an academy in London, where he was employed in 1765. He had also considerable experience of various sides of life, having served for a time on "the *King of Prussia* privateer," married, and held the office of exciseman in several places. Paine possessed some qualities not so common in his countrymen; first of all, a profoundly religious nature, which at first was manifested in a tendency to apply scriptural phrases to real things, but ultimately expressed itself in those earnest negations which gained him the name of infidel; secondly, he was morally a man of the world, entirely without that insularity which is sometimes confused with patriotism. Franklin having said, "Where liberty is, there is my country," Paine amended the saying with, "Where liberty is not, there is mine."

Such was the man, and with such antecedents, who emigrated to America at the moment when the colonists were fighting against the powers which were even more hated, because more hopelessly, by poor men like himself in England. The third Georgian reign, with its corruptions and its unconquerable stupidities, could hardly be seen through three thousand miles, as they were seen by English radicals who read the speeches of Pitt and the invectives of Junius. Paine was a sort of English ambassador of this sentiment to which Transatlantic independence was a dream, while in America it was a dread. In the preface of that work which literally electrified the American people are these words, "The cause of America is in a great measure the cause of all mankind."

The work referred to is that entitled *Common Sense*. It was published January 1, 1776, and was the first work of Paine's which reached the entire nation. The circulation speedily ran to a hundred thousand. Concerning the effect it produced there can be no question. Upon this point his admirers and enemies agree. Rush, who refused to renew acquaintance with him because of his infidelity, at the same time (1809) wrote, "*Common Sense* burst from the press with an effect which has rarely been produced by types and paper in any age or country." Washington writes to General Reed, March, 1776, "By private letters which I have lately received from Virginia, I find that *Common Sense* is working a powerful change in the minds of many men." And again, "A few more such flaming arguments as were exhibited at Falmouth and Norfolk, added to the sound doctrine and unanswerable reasoning contained in the pamphlet *Common Sense*, will not leave numbers at a loss to decide on the propriety of a separation." General Lee writes to Washington, "Have you seen the pamphlet *Common Sense*? I never saw such a masterly irresistible performance. It will, if I mistake not, in concurrence with the transcendent folly and wickedness of the Ministry,

give the *coup de grâce* to Great Britain. In short, I own myself convinced by the arguments of the necessity of separation." But there is no need to accumulate such quotations. John Adams (who detested Paine), Jefferson, Franklin, the contemporary historians Gordon and Ramsay, and all cognisant of the facts, even including Cheetham, unite in the testimony that this first appeal for American independence did more than anything else to unite the colonies around that aim, and render any subsequent compromise impossible. Among the many examples of its effect one may be mentioned. By request of General Scott, a leading member of the New York Assembly, who was alarmed at the still semi-treasonable position of Paine, a number of distinguished members of that body met to read the pamphlet and prepare an answer. They met several evenings. When the readings were ended they unanimously concluded to attempt no answer.

That Thomas Paine was a charlatan, and his writings shams, is now so often assumed, that perhaps one may, without arrogance, express concurrence with the estimate of the American statesmen and generals. If an essay is to be judged, like an organism in nature, by its degree of adequacy to its own ends, Paine's *Common Sense* may be numbered among the few perfect works; and those who regard the detachment of the English colonies in America, and their constitution as a republic, in the light of a necessary world-event, may further regard as a great work the pamphlet so adapted to a great purpose. To that purpose, if it were to succeed, it was necessary to unite thirteen colonies, representing several centres of various history, interest, religion, and even, to some extent, of race. The people of New England, severely trained in the religion of obedience to rulers, and rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; the Dutch population of New York, so slow to arouse; the Quakers of Pennsylvania, with their already loud testimonies against armed resistance; the old English families of Maryland, Virginia, and elsewhere, whose pride as well as sentiment clung to "the mother country," as so many in Canada now do; all these must be combined and concentrated upon an aim which, if it should fail, would be treason,—if it should succeed, would but launch them upon an unknown sea, whose farther shore was haunted by dangers more formidable than their pilgrim fathers had encountered. Paine begins by penetrating the superstition about Government. It is the expedient of men living in society to defend themselves against the wickedness of exceptional persons. They prudently surrender part of their property to protect the rest. "Society in every state is a blessing, but Government in its best state is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one; for when we suffer or are exposed to the same miseries by a Government, which we might expect in a

country without a Government, our calamity is heightened by reflecting that we furnish the means by which we suffer." There follows an illustration likely to tell upon the colonial mind—a small number of people in some sequestered region; their co-operation under common difficulties, their decrease of reciprocal attachment when prosperity did away with dangers which had bound them in a common cause; the appearance of vice, followed by the need of regulations. "Some convenient tree will afford them a state-house, under the branches of which the whole colony may assemble to deliberate on public matters. . . . In this first Parliament every man by natural right will have a seat." But with increase of the colony general convenience will require the selection of a few from the whole body. This is all very simple, and says Paine, "the more simple anything is, the less liable is it to be disordered, and the easier repaired when disordered." With which maxim in view he reaches, on the fourth page, the Constitution of England. "Absolute Governments (through the disgrace of human nature) have this advantage with them, that they are simple; if the people suffer they know the head from which their suffering springs, know likewise the remedy, and are not bewildered by a variety of causes and cures. But the Constitution of England is so exceedingly complex that the nation may suffer for years together, without being able to discover in which part the fault lies; some will say in one and some in another, and every political physician will advise a different medicine."

The English Constitution, he says, is compounded of—1. the remains of Monarchical Tyranny in the person of the King; 2. the remains of Aristocratical Tyranny in the persons of the Peers; 3. the new Republican Materials in the persons of the Commons, on whose virtue depends the freedom of England. "To say that the Constitution of England is a *union* of three powers, reciprocally *checking* each other, is farcical." How came the King by a power which the People are afraid to trust and always obliged to check? This question, which it is always so easy for a peaceful and prosperous people to answer, was put by Paine to a nation who knew none of those practical advantages of monarchy which are its only real arguments. A power, he says, that needs checking, cannot be from God, nor could it be the gift of a wise people. Nor, he adds, is the check adequate, while the King is giver of places and pensions. "Though we have been wise enough to shut and lock a door against absolute Monarchy, we at the same time have been foolish enough to put the Crown in possession of the key." General principles like these are followed by a scriptural argument. It is presented with entire sincerity—for the *Age of Reason* is yet fifteen years away—and makes such use of the divine reproofs of the Israelites for wishing a king

as could not have been answered by any pulpit in the land at that day.

Samuel's diatribe (I. viii. 10) plentifully interlarded with applications, ending with "Ye shall cry out in that day because of your King which ye shall have chosen, and the Lord will not hear you in that day," passed from the pen of Paine to the pulpits as the voice of prophecy. With equal force did the author touch every variety of sentiment. Did the Quakers long for peace? Kings and civil wars go together. "Thirty kings and two minors have reigned in that distracted kingdom (England) since the Conquest, in which time there have been (including the Revolution) no less than eight civil wars and nineteen rebellions." Did the old gentlemen talk tenderly of the old home and mother country? There lay the dead of Concord and Lexington, there was the cold, unnatural disdain of every petition; "wherefore since nothing but blows will do, for God's sake let us come to a final separation, and not leave the next generation to the cutting of throats under the violated unmeaning names of parent and child." Were some faint-hearted? He reminded them how many allies they might expect as an independent country; how America was without an enemy in the world except as being a part of Great Britain. He awakened the poor by tracing poverty to dependence, and pointing out the vast resources of the country which, could America trade directly with foreign nations, would make them the richest of nations. He also enlisted the pride of the non-English settlers by his sentence—"Europe, and not England, is the parent country of America." Nay, even the Reconciliationists he convinced by his argument to show the perils of their plan, even were it possible—an argument which the King was rendering final by his speech on the same day that Paine's pamphlet was published. In addition to this there was a remarkably clear outline of a colonial republic such as might be formed, and a demonstration of the presence of both the men and means to conduct the same. "No writer," wrote Jefferson, "has exceeded Paine in ease and familiarity of style, in perspicuity of expression, happiness of elucidation, and in simple and unassuming language." This is eminently true of *Common Sense*, which is almost as free from suggestion of the writer's personality as the Declaration of Independence. The man is utterly merged in the cause he has espoused, and the result is a style never arrogant, yet strangely authentic. Its wonderful effect was much enhanced by the knowledge that its author had devoted the copyright to the colonies.

The year which gave the Colonies their Declaration of Independence on paper, brought them mainly reverses on the field. Things went from bad to worse, until, late in the winter, Washington wrote to a Congress which had fled for safety, "Ten days

more will put an end to this army." At that time Paine was serving under Washington as a common soldier, and every night, while others tried to snatch a little repose, he was writing his next great production, that number of *The Crisis* whose vast effect has made it historic. It was a little piece, afterwards printed in eight pages, written by the light of camp-fires during Washington's retreat through the Jerseys with only 2,600 men, his best arms in the hands of the enemy. The last sentence was written on the 23rd of December (1776), and Washington summoned together his dismayed and shivering soldiers to hear it read. It opened with these words:—"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it *now*, deserves the thanks of man and woman."

On the Christmas night after this was read to the remnant of his army, Washington recrossed the Delaware, and on the following day encountered the British forces at Trenton. It was the first victory of the Americans. The soldiers rushed into battle with the cry, "These are the times that try men's souls," and the nation ascribed their triumph to the pen of Paine. He speedily became the most popular man in America. Public expressions of gratitude poured in upon him from Congress and the State legislatures, with testimonials in money—it being found that he had impoverished himself by giving his copyrights to the national cause—and the University of Pennsylvania awarded him the degree of A.M. The United States Congress elected him Secretary of its most important Committee, that of Foreign Affairs. And though he presently lost this by his "imprudence"<sup>1</sup> in attacking a fraudulent claim urged against the nation by one Silas Deane, who was backed by an American clique and the French Government, the State of Pennsylvania made him Clerk of its Legislature. While serving in this capacity, it became Paine's duty on one occasion (1780) to read to the Legislature a letter from Washington describing the deplorable situation caused by the capture of Charleston by the British. "A despairing silence pervaded the House" when this letter had been read, for the treasury was empty. Paine at once drew his salary, and, proposing a subscription, headed it with five hundred dollars. He was the poorest man present, and the others at once came forward with their contributions which, taken up by Congress, surmounted the emergency.

(1) *Journals of Congress*, Jan. 7-16, 1779. A similar disregard of his own interests was shown by Paine in a pamphlet written by him against certain cherished territorial claims of Virginia, at a time when a bill was pending in the Legislature of that State to offer him a sum of money. As he was forewarned, his pamphlet defeated the bill. (Letter of Lee to Washington, 23rd July, 1784.) In the Deane affair, Congress showed its appreciation of the patriotic character of Paine's "imprudence" by voting him three thousand dollars.

Paine had for some years indulged the hope of influencing affairs in England. "I was strongly impressed with the idea that if I could get over to England without being known, and only remain in safety till I could get out a publication, I could open the eyes of the country with respect to the madness and stupidity of the government." Full of this hope he went to Paris in 1787, bearing with him letters of introduction to eminent men there, and, after a brief sojourn, the same year crossed to England, and hastened to Thetford. His father was dead; he settled on his mother a weekly allowance of nine shillings. At this time he appears to have been mainly occupied with an iron bridge which he had invented, a model of which had been exhibited to the Academy of Sciences in Paris and received its approbation. The bridge was cast and erected at Rotherham, Yorkshire, in 1790. At the close of the same year Paine was engaged writing, at the Angel, Islington, his *Rights of Man*. Part I. appeared in 1791, Part II. in 1792. And now Paine's collaborateurs, so far as his literary success was concerned—the Ministry—came to his aid again. The work reached a circulation of nearly forty thousand, on its merits as an answer to Burke. Ferocious denunciations of it, culminating in a prosecution and outlawry of the author, secured for it a reading hardly less than that which *Common Sense* had enjoyed in America. "Paine's *Rights of Man*," says Hazlitt, "was the only really powerful reply [to Burke's *Reflections*]; and, indeed, so powerful and explicit that the government undertook to crush it by an *ex-officio* information, and by a declaration of war against France, to still the ferment and excite an odium against its admirers, as taking part with a foreign enemy against their prince and country."

Paine had a sixpenny edition of the work printed, from which the profit on each copy was twopence; nevertheless it speedily earned £1,000, which Paine, though still poor, gave to the Society of Constitutional Information, in London, to be distributed as they should see best. This society circulated vast numbers of Paine's works, and among other things 12,000 copies of his *Letter to Mr. Secretary Dundas*, one of the most effective things Paine ever wrote. Dundas (May 25, 1792) had opened the debate in the House of Commons on the proclamation against "wicked and seditious publications," and had especially directed the epithets against the *Rights of Man*. This gave Paine an opportunity which he was not likely to disregard, and his reply took the form of a contrast between the then uncomfortable state of financial and other affairs in England, and the prosperity which was already springing up in America.

Legal proceedings were instituted against Paine for his book, May 21, and he resolved to defend himself in person at the trial, which was appointed for the following December. This determination was changed by a deputation which came from France to inform



him of his election by the department of Calais to represent them in the National Convention. The government did not detain him, probably were glad to be rid of him; at any rate, in the state of public feeling at the time, an arrest of an American citizen and member of the French Convention might have been attended with serious complications.

While Paine was the theme of a new national anthem with one party, and was being burnt in effigy by another in his native land, he passed to Calais to be welcomed as a hero, and thence made a sort of triumphal journey to France. But he had left behind him the times that tried men's souls. During the whole of the year 1793 the Government was mainly employed in trying to trample out the works of Paine. Taking the last six months of that year, we find in the *Cambridge Independent*, the only paper audacious enough even to print full reports of the proceedings, paragraphs which reveal the extent of the crusade. The religious heresies of Paine had not yet been printed in England, and the work mainly prosecuted was *The Rights of Man*. On July 18 Mr. Cook, a baker at Cambridge, was sentenced to three months' imprisonment for having, three years and a half previously, said that "he wished all the churches were pulled down to mend the roads with; and as to the King's Chapel, he should like to see it turned into a stable." In the ardour of ferreting out Paine's works, this ancient offence, like many others, was brought to light and punished. At Nottingham, Daniel Holt, for selling a volume by Paine, was sentenced to £50 fine, two years' imprisonment, with two sureties for good behaviour afterwards. The Messrs. Robinson, publishers, were fined £200 for selling a copy, though the firm had published "A Protest against Mr. Paine's Works." A boy named Sutton, at Ashfield, was fined £20, with a year's imprisonment, for "avowing himself a Painite." George Eden, for the same offence, was fined one shilling and imprisoned six months. Peart and Belcher, at Warwick, Phillips at Leicester, and many other booksellers, were fined and imprisoned; among these being Mr. Spence, "in Little Turnstile, Holborn," which cannot be far from where Mr. Truelove has so long freely sold the works of Paine, and others much more radical, beside the little table on which Paine wrote *The Rights of Man*. In the few cases where gentlemen were found distributing the books the penalties were very severe. Thus Mr. Fische Palmer was sentenced at Perth to seven years' transportation for assisting the publication and circulation of Paine's works, in the interest of parliamentary reforms to which he had been for many years devoted. Mr. Thomas Muir, of Huntershill, for having advised persons to read "the works of that wretched outcast Paine" (to quote the Lord Advocate's words), was actually sentenced to fourteen years' transportation. The sentence was received amid

hisses from the gallery. The tipstaff being ordered by the Lord Justice-Clerk to take those who hissed into custody, replied, "My lord, they're all hissing." There were, indeed, large numbers of people who viewed these proceedings with indignation, but something like an apparent suppression was at length reached. The famous town-crier of Bolton who reported to his masters that he had been round that place "and found neither the Rights of Man nor Common Sense in it," made a statement characteristic of the time. Yet at that time there were in the country more than a hundred thousand volumes of Paine in circulation among the people. They were read in secret, and the race of old Radicals has hardly run out which remembers reading the books on Sundays in fields—in groups, whose numbers alternately read, listened, and went off to keep a look-out for the police.

For a little time after his arrival in Paris, Paine enjoyed what to the majority of the republicans in his time would have been all that the heart of man could desire. It was a year of sunshine, but Paine never outgrew his Quakerism, and hated all the fuss and pomp with which the Parisians insisted on lionising "the author-hero of the Revolution." Possibly he might have adapted himself to such things better had he been able to speak the French language; but as he did not, he was probably embarrassed by the attentions he received. Madame Roland has expressed, in her *Appeal*, the regret she felt at being unable to converse with Paine; but she listened carefully to his discourse with others, and being able to understand English, she was impressed by "the boldness of his conceptions, the originality of his style, the striking truths he throws out bravely among those whom they offend." Paine was described by Aaron Burr, hypercritical in such matters, as a gentleman; and the sense in which he was so may be understood from a passage in one of Lord Edward Fitzgerald's letters from Paris to his mother,— "I lodge with my friend Paine; we breakfast, dine, and sup together. The more I see of his interior the more I like and respect him. I cannot express how kind he has been to me. There is a simplicity of manner, a goodness of heart, and a strength of mind in him that I never knew a man before to possess." Paine was, however, deficient in the dexterities of general society; he could not comprehend the pride that infuses what is called loyalty, nor such transmitted instincts as those which make the moral accent of words like infidel and miscreant. That was good arable soil to him which to some around him was burning lava,—for instance to that young aristocrat, Captain Grimstone, who once leaped from the table at a dinner-party and struck him on the head, calling him an incendiary and traitor to his country. The old man of sixty only resented this by saving the young man's life—it being punishable

with death to strike a deputy—and providing him with money to leave the country.

This was not the only instance of Paine's personal kindness to members of the high English circle, whose ordinary toast in those days was "Damnation to Thomas Paine!" He gave £200 to General O'Hara, who was his fellow-prisoner. These incidents, however, made little impression in his favour, and it was, perhaps, the only glad tidings which had reached the ruling class in England from Paris for many a day when it was announced by the London journals that Paine had been guillotined. The fact that Paine must have suffered under sentence of revolutionists for mercy to a fallen monarch seemed only to sweeten their revenge.

Coming as the rumour of his death did along with the terrible *Age of Reason*, it was easily shown to be a divine judgment. But, in fact, it was Paine who could felicitate himself on providential intervention. The facts are sufficiently striking. Neither soldiering under Washington, agitating revolutions, nor lionising at republican courts, had destroyed the Quaker of Thetford; and when it was proposed to execute the King, it was he who rose up in the French Convention and testified against capital punishment, begging them to kill the King, but spare the man. He pleaded that Louis Capet should be banished to America—for his education! "He may learn from the constant aspect of public prosperity that the true system of government consists not in kings, but in fair, equal, and honourable representation." The angry radicals of the Robespierre faction were utterly unable to comprehend this language in the supposed arch-firebrand of America, and it looks as if they suspected that the English had bought him: at any rate, after he had been thrown into prison, the Americans in Paris went in a body to demand his release, and were refused on the ground that Paine was an English citizen.

It was also stated to the American deputation that the American Minister, Morris, had taken no interest in the case, which unhappily was true. Paine could understand that; there were private reasons for the hostility of Morris; but neither he nor any American in Europe doubted that when the tidings had reached the United States that nation would be indignant, and that Washington, now President, would instantly demand his friend's release. In that, too, he was disappointed. Washington gave no sign, but left Paine to languish in prison for nearly a year. This was equivalent to a death-sentence coming from Washington. Though Monroe came as Minister, superseding Morris, and exerted himself to the utmost to secure Paine's release, it was soon discovered by Robespierre that he had brought no instruction favourable to Paine; and the sentence of death was passed. On the night when a chalk-mark was put on the door of each prisoner who was to be executed in the morning,

Paine's door happened to be open, so that when closed the mark was on the inside. By this accident his life was preserved. A few days after, Robespierre fell. But though that fall occurred on the 27th July, it was not until the 4th of November (1794) that Paine was set at liberty—the continued silence of Washington causing the belief that the imprisonment was agreeable to him.

This was a terrible humiliation. Washington was now a hero in the eyes of all Europe, and his published praises of Paine were known to the world. Paine had dedicated to Washington his first work on the *Rights of Man*, and to Lafayette his second; and it was to him that Lafayette had entrusted the key of the Bastille to be presented to Washington. After all this Washington delivers him up silently to death! Whatever may have been the cause, no one can wonder at the bitterness of the letter which Paine wrote to Washington after it, and it would seem to require a great deal of partiality to judge the passionate words of the aggrieved prisoner *au pied de la lettre*, while putting indulgent constructions on the deliberate and never-explained action of Washington.

On his way to prison Paine had managed to call at the rooms of one of the most eminent American writers of that time, Joel Barlow, and entrust to him the manuscript of a work on which he had for some time been engaged—the *Age of Reason*. Even in childhood, Paine tells us, he had rebelled against some features of the popular theology; but the long struggle with poverty, the American revolution, political controversies, prevented his giving much attention to the subjects treated in the *Age of Reason* until later life; and there are evidences in his earlier works that, while abandoning the more familiar dogmas of orthodoxy, he had not especially considered such subjects as supernaturalism and the general value of the Bible until after the American revolution had ceased. There was, indeed, in most of the political leaders in that revolution a sceptical spirit, as was only natural when it is remembered that George III. was the visible head of the Church. The late Hon. Jared Sparks, while President of Harvard University, showed me some letters which passed between Jefferson and Paine on religious subjects. I believe they are still withheld from the public, and no doubt more for the sake of the great Virginian's reputation than for that of Paine, who, as I remember, was by no means the more unorthodox of the two. It was indeed the earnest way in which Paine regarded all matters of human interest, his religious sense of the duty of testifying against what he considered public errors and wrongs, even at such cost as Fox, Barclay, and other saints of the Thetford household had paid before him, which led to the *Age of Reason* and the author's impalement. Even as regards positive beliefs, Paine was nearer to the received standards than many who now join in the hue and cry

against him. On the first page of his denounced work he says,—“I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life. I believe the equality of man; and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavouring to make our fellow-creatures happy.” There is no action or word in Paine’s life or writings which impeaches the sincerity of this creed. But he further believed what many liberal thinkers yet do not, that “it is necessary to the happiness of man that he be mentally faithful to himself. Infidelity does not consist in believing, or in disbelieving; it consists in professing to believe what he does not believe.” The negative positions of the *Age of Reason* are still exercising a profound influence on innumerable minds, despite the repeated announcement that the book is dead and buried. It would be difficult to find in any modern work more forcible popular statements than those found on nearly every page. “Admitting that something has been revealed to a certain person, it is revelation to the first person only and hearsay to every other.” “The trinity of gods was no other than a reduction of the former plurality, which was about twenty or thirty thousand; the statue of Mary succeeded the statue of Diana of Ephesus; the deification of heroes changed into the canonisation of saints; the mythologists had gods for everything; the Christian mythologists had saints for everything; the Church became as crowded with the one as the Pantheon had been with the other; and Rome was the place of both.” “The morality that he (Christ) preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind; and though similar systems of morality had been preached by Confucius, and by some of the Greek philosophers, many years before, by the Quakers since, and by many good men in all ages, it has not been exceeded by any.” “The Christian mythologists tell us that then Satan made war against the Almighty, who defeated him and confined him afterwards . . . in a pit; . . . the fable of Jupiter and the Giants was told many hundred years before that of Satan.” “They represent him (Satan) as having compelled the Almighty to the direct necessity either of surrendering the whole of the creation to the government and sovereignty of this Satan, or of capitulating for its redemption by coming down upon earth, and exhibiting himself upon a cross in the shape of a man. . . . They make the transgressor triumph and the Almighty fall.” “Is the gloomy pride of man become so intolerable, that nothing can flatter it but a sacrifice of the Creator?” “When we contemplate the immensity of that Being who directs and governs the incomprehensible WHOLE, of which the utmost ken of human sight can discover but a part, we ought to feel shame at calling such paltry stories (*e.g.* that of Samson and Delilah, the foxes, &c.) the Word of God.” “It (the Church) has set up a religion of pomp and of revenue, in pre-

tended imitation of a person whose life was humility and poverty." "The Word of God is the Creation we behold . . . which no human invention can counterfeit or alter." "The Creation speaketh an universal language."

What homage should we have heard if, in any orthodox work of the last century, had occurred the far-seeing astronomic speculations of the *Age of Reason*! It was from the humble man who in early life studied his globes, purchased at cost of many a dinner, and attended the lectures of Martin, Ferguson, and Bevis, that there came twenty-one years before Herschel's famous paper on the Nebulæ, the sentence,—“The probability, therefore, is that each of those fixed stars is also a sun, round which another system of worlds or planets, though too remote for us to discover, performs its revolutions.”

It has been so often said as to have become a general belief, that the *Age of Reason* is a mass of ribaldry. The work, however, is a very serious one, and the sentences I have quoted are characteristic of its spirit. In patiently going through the Old and New Testaments, and examining narratives for which literal inspiration was claimed, it was impossible not to point out primitive features which seem grotesque when made salient amid modern customs and ideas. There are a few instances in which Paine dwells upon the absurdity which is presented to his mind,—in one or two cases with questionable taste, as in his picture of the people coming out of their graves and walking about Jerusalem, according to Matthew,—but I know of no similar investigation in which the writer's mind is so generally fixed upon the simple question of truth and falsehood, and so rarely addicted to ridicule. Few will deny the difficulty, however reverent the reciter, of relating the story of Jonah and the whale without causing a smile. Paine's smile is in two sentences; in one place he says it would have been nearer to the idea of a miracle if Jonah had swallowed the whale, elsewhere that if credulity could swallow Jonah and the whale it could swallow anything. But after this, for him, unusual approach to the ribaldry of which he is so freely accused, Paine gives over three pages of criticism on the Book of Jonah, not only grave and careful, but presenting perhaps the earliest appreciation of the moral elevation and large aim of that much-neglected legend.

A great many sneers have been directed against Paine because of the fact mentioned by himself, with his usual *naïveté*, that when he wrote Part I. of the *Age of Reason* he had not a copy of the Bible in his room. But the circumstance is not without its more impressive significance. Paine had already received intimation that his arrest was certain and near. The guillotine was within the shadow closing about him. There was but one anxiety it brought—the remem-

brance that he had not yet written a sentence of that testimony against superstition, which had been gathering the importance of his final duty to mankind. For ordinary purposes he had no need of a Bible; he had been in all his early life fed on little else; he had now to run a race with the faction of Robespierre. This book was written during the few days of liberty remaining to him, and six hours after the last sentence was penned he was on his way to prison. He addressed it "to the protection of the citizens of the United States," managed to get it into the hands of Joel Barlow, and so soon as he could get pen and paper began in prison Part II. of the same work. The greater part, therefore, of the book was written by a man who believed that death was near and certain. Part II. was destined, however, to be published when he had become free, and was able to refer to chapter and verse with a fulness and accuracy which his opponents liked far less than the more vague and reserved allusions of the first production. Mr. Yorke, a well-known Englishman of the time, who visited him in Paris, wrote: "The Bible is the only book which he has studied, and there is not a verse in it that is not familiar to him."

Paine's life abounds in such curious incidents, and instances of luck, that at a somewhat earlier period he would probably have been supposed under the protection of the devil for a term. The incident of the chalk mark which had saved him from the guillotine was followed by a long fever, during which his insensibility for a month prevented further proceedings against him; and, when he was at liberty, he engaged a passage for America in a vessel commanded by Commodore Barney, but was detained by some slight circumstances which saved his life, for the vessel sank at sea.

Paine had become utterly disgusted with French politics. He was receiving every day reproaches from England because of his *Age of Reason*, many of his former friends having turned against him. The echoes from America were as yet few. The neglect of him in his distress by Washington was counterbalanced by the friendship of the new President, Jefferson, who had offered him an American ship in which to return. The sufferings and fever which he had undergone in prison had seriously impaired his health and strength; indeed he never recovered them again. He more than ever pictured America as the one perfect land. To a lady who wrote to him from New York, he replied—"You touch me on a very tender point when you say that my friends on your side the water cannot be reconciled to the idea of my abandoning America, even for my native England. They are right. I had rather see my horse, Button, eating the grass of Bordertown, or Morrisiana, than see all the pomp and show of Europe." But a terrible disenchantment awaited him. When he returned to America it was to find most of his old friends turned to

enemies. The very lady who had so written, and her husband, refused to receive the author of the *Age of Reason*, which now had become the horror of every pulpit; Samuel Adams, Benjamin Rush, and of course Washington, would have nothing to do with him. The Federalists of the North who wished to make the United States another England, and hated everything French, dreaded him; the slaveholders of the South had been alarmed at his having written about the abolition of slavery—"We must push that matter further on your side of the water. I wish that a few well-instructed negroes could be sent among their brethren in bondage; for, until they are enabled to take their own part, nothing will be done."<sup>1</sup> The nation which he had left glorified by enthusiasm for liberty, had sunk to the work of protecting slavery; sectarianism and dogmatism, having lost their ancient supports in the State, were industriously replacing them with a revival of intolerance before which great men were bowing who used to talk more heresy than Paine. The poor man was almost abandoned. It need hardly excite wonder if in the solitude to which he was forced, and in his enfeebled health, the old man drank enough for pious imagination to turn him into a sot. There is not the least doubt that Paine was a temperate man up to the time when, close upon seventy, his friends began to turn from him. The weakness that followed his imprisonment first led him to use stimulants in any noticeable degree, but there is no doubt that Barlow is the truest witness in saying that Paine was a temperate man "till he conceived himself neglected and despised by his former friends in the United States." But, admitting that during the closing three years of his life—he was over seventy-two at death—Paine drank more than was good for him, it is certain that it was not enough to prevent his writing during those years many able essays, and also that it would not have been heard of but for that heterodoxy which exposeth a multitude of sins. Whether the one fault which overtook this old man, Thomas Paine, so warm-hearted and faithful, casts the darker shadow over his own career or over those who gave him up to be the scape-goat demanded by defeated bigotry and oppression, is a question on which future critics may have something to say. For the present it is enough to know that Thomas Paine has been selected for especial odium, not because he was an immoral man, for he was not that,—the only charge of that kind ever made recoiled on the accuser, and proved the singular generosity of the accused to a deserted family; not because he was irreligious, he was the reverse of that by episcopal testimony; not even because he was unorthodox, for he was chief founder of the society of Theophilanthropists in Paris (1797) in opposition to the atheistic opinions which found many adherents not only there, but in England,

(1) Written to a friend in Philadelphia from Paris, March 16, 1789.



whose fame, however, has suffered far less than that of this devout theist and admirer of Christ; but because he wrote for the people and had the power of convincing them, and this brought on a panic among those interested in the existing theological and political order. It was on the works of Paine that the battle of a free press, and that of free thought, were fought and won in England. The battle did indeed rage for many years after Paine was dead. I have before me a printed paragraph taken from an English newspaper of the year 1823, which tells a significant story:—"Some persons have, we are informed, purchased the lease of a house in Fleet Street, near St. Bride's Church, which they have underlet to Richard Carlile, for the purpose of enabling him to vend his numerous publications. This is one of the consequences of vindictive persecutions for opinions. Persecute truth, and it will be seen to flourish; persecute error, and many will be induced to embrace it from sympathy with the sufferers. Carlile was sentenced to three years' imprisonment and fines of £1,500. The three years expired in November last, and he has since been and now is held in Dorchester gaol for the fine. His sister was also sentenced to two years' imprisonment and a fine of £500. Her two years' imprisonment expired also in November, and she, who states in her petition to the House of Commons that she never possessed any property, has also been and still is detained for her fine. The consequence of these absurd persecutions has been the propagating of infidel opinions to an extent which they could not otherwise have reached, and at length to the interference of persons in a way calculated to call public attention more closely to matters which those who promoted the prosecutions wished should be suppressed. These facts speak for themselves."

Subsequent facts spoke even more loudly in the same way. The Carliles were soon released under the feeling that Miss Carlile's petition awakened in the House of Commons and in the country, and they and their successors continued to sell the works of Paine and other heresiarchs without molestation. The recent attempts to interfere with the freedom so secured, were rendered possible by the complication of the principle with moral questions which were not involved in the original struggle; but their one success—the imprisonment of Mr. Truelove—as well as their several failures, equally confess the impregnable security of the main principle for which Paine and his comrades suffered.

MONCURE D. CONWAY.

## A FAIR DAY'S WAGES FOR A FAIR DAY'S WORK.<sup>1</sup>

THE phrase which I have chosen as the title of this lecture was perhaps more commonly heard a few years since than it is now. I do not know why there should be any decline in its use, and I believe I am right in thinking that it is not less regarded than it was formerly.<sup>2</sup> Almost every one—employer as well as labourer—will accept it as an admirable expression of what should be the principle of the recompense of labour. It appears to be so just, so forcible, and so true. It contains within itself an admission that there must be something like identity of value between what is given and what is received. It expresses an equation of exchanges. If a workman is to have his fair day's wages, he must render his fair day's work. With the sense of equality thus satisfied, it may be expected that contentment will be secured on both sides. The capitalist cannot complain when he has his money's worth for his money; the labourer cannot complain when he has his labour's worth for his labour. It would appear that a simple formula would solve difficulties and contentions that have perplexed and irritated many classes, and have sometimes threatened to disturb the social equilibrium of nations. If this position can be sustained, the phrase does indeed deserve all the honour that has ever been attributed to it. Let us examine the meaning of the sentence a little more closely, that we may see whether it is entitled to the authority and respect claimed to be due to it.

A fair day's wages for a fair day's work. In the first place, what is meant by a fair day's wages? I venture to think it does not mean any definite sum of money, whether 2*s.* or 2*s.* 6*d.*, or 3*s.*, or 4*s.*, or 5*s.*, or any other sum. A little reflection will compel us to admit that it varies locally. If we cross-examined an unskilled workman here in a country town to find out from him what was his general idea of a fair day's wages, we should get at a result different from what we should obtain by a similar process in London; and that again would be different from the answer in New York, which again would be different from the answer in San Francisco, or in Melbourne. Workmen of the same race, and doing work of much the same character, would give all kinds of answers, varying from 2*s.* to 10*s.*, to the same question, "What do you consider a fair day's wages for

(1) A lecture delivered at the Mechanics' Institute, Plymouth, January, 1879.

(2) It has been advanced, since the delivery of this lecture, by Sir Charles Mills, M.P., at an agricultural dinner in Kent, as a solution of the controversy between farmers and labourers in that county and in Sussex.

your work?" If we extended our inquiries to labourers of other races, we should get a new series of replies. The fair day's wage of the French handicraftsman is not the same as that of an Englishman in the same trade; and so throughout Europe; while, if we proceed to Asia, we shall meet with much more startling varieties. A Hindoo labourer in Calcutta or Bombay will not look for more than sixpence a day; and the rate of payment expected by a Chinese is not higher. You know that one of the social difficulties of some of our Australian colonies—a difficulty that has assumed more alarming proportions in California and the Pacific States of America—is that the Chinese is willing to work for less than half the wages the man of European origin expects to receive for the same labour. Let us carry our thoughts in yet another direction. Instead of surveying the earth's surface to note the diverse rates of wages prevailing in diverse countries, we may fasten our attention upon our own, and reverse the course of time to note the diverse rates of wages prevailing in successive generations. In the course of such a review we find labourers receiving in England less than a coolie now receives in India, and yet accepting the payment as a fair day's wages.

A fair day's wages evidently means different things in different times, and in different countries; and, indeed, it means different things at the same time and in the same place, in reference to different races. But the phrase is useless unless we can find some one idea underlying it, in spite of all these variations. It does not denote a fixed sum of money, but it may perhaps indicate some fixed quantity of money's worth. How will this suggestion stand examination? Do the variations in wages correspond to variations in prices, so that, although the money received changes, the amount of goods and commodities that can be bought for the money, or—to use a wide expression—the quantity of conveniences that can be secured by it, remains unchanged? There are many circumstances that appear to support this hypothesis. We know that when the prices of commodities rise, a demand is not unfrequently made on the part of workmen that their wages should also be raised. It is argued that they cannot live at the former rate of wages, and a rise in the rate is represented as the natural, if not as the necessary, consequence of a rise in the prices of things. I do not here stop to examine into the cogency of this reasoning; we are at present engaged in an attempt to ascertain what is the meaning men have in their minds when they talk of a fair day's wages, and we are being drawn to the conclusion that fair wages somehow depend upon and vary with prices. The same inference is suggested by the historical inquiry into what has been considered fair wages. We have learnt that wages have varied in the same place in successive generations, and a little examination will show that prices have also varied in much the same

direction, and possibly in approximately the same ratio. We may not be able to trace the connection in respect of any particular article, but if we take the sum of articles that are consumed by workmen we shall find that, as a rule, wages have gone up when their prices have risen, and have gone down as their prices have fallen. We may, perhaps, think that a fair day's wages means such a sum of money as would supply the ordinary and customary wants of a workman from day to day, according to the standard of comfort prevalent among them; and hence the demand for a fair day's wages is a demand that a workman shall have enough to live upon decently—a demand which, of course, covers enough to enable him to marry in due time, to set up a household, and to bring up his children about him.

Whatever we may think in other respects of this explanation of the phrase, we must admit that it helps to dispose of an anomaly we have had to notice. We saw that in the same place, *e.g.* in San Francisco or in Bombay, a fair day's wages meant widely different sums for the Chinese or Indian labourer and the labourer of European origin; but if we are to understand by these words, enough to satisfy the ordinary and customary wants of a workman, we light upon an explanation of the discrepancy. An Englishman's wants differ from those of a Chinese, and if wages are to correspond to wants, his wages must differ from those of a Chinese. At the same time it must occur to some of you that the meaning we have thus been led to attach to the phrase under discussion, refers rather to an ideal of what we might like the order of society to be, than to any conception of justice as regulating the recompense of labour. Can it be that an Englishman is entitled to look for more because he wants more, irrespective of the work he gives in exchange for his wages?

This difficulty may, perhaps, disappear when we come to examine the significance of the other part of the proverb, a fair day's work; but it presses itself on our attention in a way not to be overlooked. We are using a very vague standard of reference when we think of a fair day's wages as enough to content a man. It may be true that no single individual, no particular person, is under contemplation, so that we may dismiss the infinite varieties of wants of separate men, and dwell only on what the conscience and reason of a class recognise as the proper and sufficient satisfaction of their necessities or desires; but wants vary from class to class, from locality to locality, and from nation to nation. Can wages be regulated by wishes, however careful we are to ascertain what are the average wishes of a group of workmen? The suggestion is almost whimsical. Something more rigid must surely determine the law of payment of labourers. We may, indeed, expect that the pretension to make

wages correspond to traditional or customary wants, will be repudiated as soon as it is put before any one in a clear and definite shape. It will be at once protested that the conception of what may be called the legitimate wants of a class of workmen is indissolubly connected with the thought of the kind of work on which they are engaged. Thus a fair day's wages for a carter differs from that of an unskilled agricultural labourer, and the wages of an artisan differ from the wages of both. Those who use the phrase on which we are animadverting, and who cling to it, will say that, in their own minds, they always associate wages with work, and though they may mean by a fair day's wages for any particular kind of workman such an amount of money as shall satisfy his reasonable wants, yet his wants and demands must be regulated by the character of the work he performs. We have thus got hold of a new notion, that different classes of work deserve different rates of wages; or, at least, that men are justified in looking for different wages according to the kind of work that occupies them. We must, therefore, turn to the other branch of our text, to see what lies hidden under the words "fair day's work."

What do we understand by that fair day's work, the performance of which entitles the workman to look for sufficient wages to keep him according to some traditional or customary standard of satisfaction? The first answer to be given to this question is that the work must at least involve the idea of labour and toil. Unless a man spends himself in some way in doing something, the common sense of the world will not recognise in him any title to recompense. I need scarcely refer you to the text approved by the conscience of all, that "If any would not work, neither should he eat." There must be labour in the day's work; but is the presence of labour all that is necessary? Certainly not. A man may spend his day in carrying a heap of stones, one by one, from one side of a road to another; but unless he did this at the desire of some person, or could at least show that the transfer of the heap was of some advantage to some one, it would be in vain to seek any wages for the labour. The work must have an element of utility or convenience in it; it must afford some kind of satisfaction, there must be a *quid pro quo*, or the demand for a recompense will be peremptorily rejected. Suppose we incorporate the notion of utility in the work that is done, what follows? Can we say that if a man honestly spends his time and toil in doing something that is wanted, in satisfying some desire that exists, in performing a service that is commanded—all of which are periphrases to describe a fair day's work—he is entitled to look for an amount of wage that shall be adequate to satisfy his wants according to the standard of desire of the workmen of his class, which is understood to be the meaning of a fair day's wages? Is the quality of utility in the work performed sufficient to sustain this demand?

The theory is that when the result of the labour expended is useful, and the labour itself honestly occupies a day, the workman is entitled to look for the means of sustenance for a day. Let me suggest an example, to put this theory to the test. I wish to send a message from Plymouth to Tavistock, and I meet with a man willing to take it. He sets out in the morning, walks the whole way, delivers my message, obtains an answer, and brings it back again. It has been a day's work, and there has been a certain consumption of boot leather, in addition to the consumption of the animal tissues involved in a day's work. Having expressly engaged the messenger to do this job, I must of course pay him in full; and if three hundred years ago some gentleman of Plymouth had wished to send to a kinsman at Tavistock some story about the doings of Spain, there would have been no regular way of communicating it save by special messenger. At that time a day's wages—whatever they may then have been—would have been asked and given, with perhaps some special additional reward of trust and confidence. Carrying two or three or even a dozen messages would, however, have involved no appreciable addition of labour, and as in the process of years a man undertook the regular business of a carrier between Plymouth and Tavistock, the recompense of the service of carrying a single message would decline. Suppose just after the carrier began his business, some one who had before employed a special messenger had again occasion to send a letter to Tavistock, and the man he had employed asked for the job. We can easily imagine the conversation that would have ensued. "You can have the job, but you must not expect me to pay more than the carrier charges." "Well, sir, I don't see why you won't pay me as you used to do. It is a good day's work, and you want to have the letter carried. Live and let live, master. 'A fair day's wages for a fair day's work' is an honest old proverb." This reasoning would scarcely have prevailed; and if the employer was desirous of pursuing the conversation he might have replied, "It is a day's work, if you carry it alone; but Thomas carries a dozen to and fro, and has thus contrived to make the carrying of one only the twelfth part of a day's work, and he gets his fair day's wages according to your proverb." The labour of doing the work in the old way would be the same as ever, but a more economical way of doing it has been discovered, and the recompense is reduced so as to correspond with the labour of the new way. We know as a matter of fact that the machinery for carrying messages has become so developed among us, that the Postmaster-General will now carry a letter from Plymouth to John O'Groat's House for a penny, and a newspaper for a halfpenny, and that he makes a very large profit on the business. To use a common expression, when very cheap goods are offered us, you may not know how it is done, but that it is done is beyond all controversy.

I have dwelt upon this illustration, which may appear to some of you so trivial and ridiculous as almost to require an apology, because it brings out with great clearness many considerations that deserve attention. In it we see the process by which the price of a particular service has been cheapened; under ordinary circumstances we may know that a particular commodity is offered to us at a lower price than we have been accustomed to pay, but we do not know how the reduction in price has been brought about, and we are sometimes inclined to suspect that it has been effected at the cost of much suffering to the producer, because we are assured with perfect honesty, by the producer we do know, that he could not furnish the commodity at the reduced price and live. Our suspicion would have been unfounded in the particular case, and I submit that the presumption is that it is generally unfounded. As a rule men intend to go on living, and if any particular article is offered to us, and continuously offered at a given price, the fair conclusion is that all who have been engaged in its production have managed to live, and do manage to live out of what has been got for it. If others complain that to them the price is not remunerative, the inference is that their processes are wasteful, or that the natural circumstances amid which they labour are comparatively unfriendly, and the moral of their experience is that unless they can reform their modes of manufacture, they should transfer their energies into some other channel.

But it may be urged that they, at all events, may, or even must, be exposed to trials or privations in consequence of being thus underbid. Our simple example furnishes the answer to this argument. The man who got an occasional job as a private carrier will lose his opportunities of employment, but those who gave him work will be left with a large proportion of what they were accustomed to give him, and they will be able to disburse this in exchange for the satisfaction of new wants, which will arise as soon as the old are satisfied. The destruction of one chance occupation must be the means of the creation of others. Let me, however, put the matter before you in this broad and simple way: the fact which has caused the change under contemplation, and causes similar changes, is an instance of a diminution of the labour necessary to supply our wants. Such a process can never be other than a benefit to the whole human family. Reducing the labour of living makes it easier for men to live, and it follows that either the number of persons alive will be increased, or the comfort and ease of the existing race will be augmented. It may be that both results will be partially produced; but, one way or other, the well-being of the people must be improved by a diminution in the cost of producing the articles which contribute to their well-being.

This leads us to another thought. One of the commonest of popular opinions, especially among workmen, is that it is a bene-

ficial thing to make work—beneficial at least to workmen, if not to the whole of the community. But investigation compels us to condemn this as an error. We benefit the mass of workmen by reducing the amount of work necessary for the accomplishment of any result. All our daily labour is devoted to the end of satisfying our wants—not merely the wants of the rich, but the wants of all; and if we discover the means of satisfying these wants without labour or with less labour the benefit extends to all. If any remain unconvinced, let me submit for their consideration an application of the mode of argument which logicians call *Reductio ad absurdum*. Suppose Heaven rained upon us daily twopenny loaves in sufficient quantity to meet our daily consumption. Should we welcome this shower as a blessing or reject it as an injury? The bakers would be ruined by it. The millers would find their wheels stopped. The growers of wheat would have no sale for their harvest. Landowners would be forced to abate their rents. Yet it is plain that the nation would be the better for it; and that we should be again better, and always better, if one by one our wants were supplied without labour, and every industry in turn destroyed. Think out this. If you once master it, you will never be in danger of being led away by the miserable nonsense to which we are now condemned to listen on many sides. What if twopenny loaves were rained upon us? The mass of commodities—eatables, drinkables, house-accommodation, clothing, literature, &c. &c.—which we now give to bakers, millers, farmers, landowners, for the loaves their associated industries and sacrifices produce, would still be forthcoming, and at the disposition of those who at present exchange them for twopenny loaves. For the moment there would be a disorganization of industry; but bakers and their allies would, at once, get their own bread without labour, and there would be the means open to them and to their children to obtain all the other commodities they have been in the habit of receiving, if they could offer to the rest of the community the gratification of some desire not before evoked, still less satisfied. There is no difference in principle between this imaginary and miraculous dispensation of the labour required to produce a desired result, and that diminution of labour which is continually brought about by industrial improvements. It is not work we want, but the results of work. Producers are not producers for the sake of production: they produce that they may consume; the means exist for the end, and are not in themselves any object of affection or desire.

Before we dismiss this illustration let me carry it on another stage. I have supposed the case of a man offering to carry letters or messages between Plymouth and Tavistock, but there is a limit to the number of letters any one man can carry. We can conceive the possibility of two or three men being thus engaged as letter-carriers between the two towns. If one of them being of a careful, and fore-



looking disposition, put by a little of what he got daily, and employed his off-time until he had provided some poor place of shelter and some small store of provender for a pony from the moor, he might largely multiply his carrying power by using such a beast of burden, and thus open up another way of reducing the remuneration required to recompense the carrier. We need not retrace the reasoning we have pursued, to be assured that this new revolution is beneficial to the whole community. The labour of producing a particular result has been again diminished, and this time by the introduction into use of what in technical language we call capital. The charge of carrying a letter will be reduced. What will it be? The man must receive for all the letters and packages he may carry (1) enough to keep himself—"a fair day's wages;" (2) enough to keep his pony; (3) enough to lay by to enable him to get another pony when the present is past work—"wear and tear;" and (4) something to reward him for his past prudence and forethought, and to tempt him to maintain it. This last item is obviously quite indeterminate. At first he might secure for himself nearly all the advantage of the new economy of work he had introduced, *i.e.* he might charge some rate only just below what had been charged before by hand carriers; but the advantage of the use of a pony being demonstrated, others would imitate him, and the competition between these pony-owning capitalists would bring down this item of remuneration to some tolerably recognised standard. In this way some normal rate of remuneration for carrying a letter would be reached, and it would certainly be much less than the day's wages any man would look for. If the primitive carrier still urged that carrying a single letter was a fair day's work, and deserved a fair day's wages, he would receive no attention; and, indeed, have we not found that the popular phrase with which we started is perfectly worthless as a principle for the apportionment of wages? It is clear that neither in the quantity of work spent, nor in the result attained, can we find any constant measure of the wages the workman will command. We may even begin to suspect that the wages actually received and paid do constitute the "fair wages" of the labourer, although we may be confronted with numberless instances of special workmen being unable to live on such wages, while doing their work in the way known to them and their fathers before them. It may be suggested as a hypothesis, to be sustained by further proof, that the working of the social machine, although we cannot trace its operations from beginning to end, does automatically bring about this result, that the market wages for any piece of work correspond to the labour necessary to produce it in the shortest way and under the best circumstances accessible to general use.

We have found our rule worthless as a means of determining wages, but the inquiry is raised whether wages may not naturally

conform to it in an open market. We cannot assign any unalterable limits to a fair day's wages or a fair day's work; but there is reason to suspect that, as a rule, fair work is fairly paid for, even when wages appear to be starvation wages. It is worth while to take a new departure to test this proposition. Let me ask you to exert your imagination to suppose that Devonshire is an island, and we will assume at first that it is isolated from the rest of the world. The area thus presented to our thoughts is big enough to sustain a fair population, even under such conditions, and yet small enough for us to disembarass ourselves of much of the complexity that prevents our appreciating the working of the machinery of modern life. The inhabitants of the county must, of course, be fed, clothed, and housed, but all the materials of food, of clothing, and of housing must be got within the county. Fix your attention on those who would be engaged in producing the materials of food. Some would raise corn, others would rear cattle; out of what they got a certain portion would be consumed as the means of sustenance of their own lives, but all the rest would be distributed through many channels among the rest of the people, and would be the sustenance of their lives. Would it be given to them gratuitously? Certainly not. It would all pass in exchange for services rendered or commodities transferred to these food-producers, and we must conclude that equality is the governing principle of the exchanges thus accomplished. If the food-producer succeeded for a time in getting for what he gave, something which required more labour to produce than what he was giving, so that he had the better of the bargain, there would be generated a movement from that more arduous to his more facile labours redressing the balance; and if he had the worse of the bargain, the movement would be in the contrary direction. Underlying all the oscillations of exchanges would be found this fundamental principle—the equivalence of the results of the expenditure of equal quantities of raw labour; and by this phrase “raw labour,” is meant labour that has in it no special element of natural dexterity or acquired craft. Our first rough conception of our island-county is that of a community of farmers, millers, bakers, butchers, spinners, weavers, tailors, masons, miners, metal-workers, woodmen, craftsmen of all kinds, to which may be at least added, medicine men and ministers of religion, giving and receiving in endless exchanges and cross-exchanges of services, so that all that each class produces gets distributed among all the rest; and in this distribution we seem to detect one guiding principle, viz. the equivalence of the results of equal quantities of raw labour. I think we may catch some other principles at work. We had a glimpse just now of the notion of capital. A man works with the assistance of some machine—in the case we had under consideration it was that animate machine, a pony—greatly increasing the efficiency of his

work, and this machine is the investment of something he saved, when he might have spent it. We saw that he must get, in addition to the direct remuneration of his own labour, sufficient to replace the wear and tear of the machine he employs, and something that shall reward his saving and induce him to maintain it. The rate of this something must depend, we saw, on competition, *i.e.* on the force of the propensity in the community to save and invest savings in production; and we can tell experimentally what is the measure of this in any generation, though it may vary from generation to generation.

We may thus realise a second principle underlying exchanges. There must be reckoned the raw labour expended, the wear and tear of the capital used, the reward of the capitalist for having saved the capital used. Some of you may wish to raise at once the question, What will happen when the workman is not also the capitalist? Suppose one man lends the machine and the other uses it, how will it be ascertained what is due to the raw labour and what to the use of capital in the joint product? We have already seen reason to believe that the measure of the reward of the capitalist depends upon the competition between capitalists; a single capitalist might engross for himself nearly all the advantage that labour *plus* capital has over unassisted labour, but this is a prize that tempts many competitors until the rate is brought down to what satisfies the saving propensity of the time. A little reflection will, moreover, lead us to think that the recompense of raw labour and the reward of the capitalist are, except during brief periods of transition, independent of one another.<sup>1</sup> At any moment a controversy might arise between a labourer and a capitalist, and one or the other might win; but the permanent reward of each must satisfy each, and the conditions of exchange of the commodity they have joined in producing will be modified until the labourer gets the current reward of raw labour, and the capitalist the current reward of capital. We have seen how the latter is determined. We know, too, that according to our first principle, the reward of raw labour tends to be the same for all applications of it. Can we find any measure of what it will be? By taking up again the train of previous thoughts we may perhaps hit upon it. The tendency towards an equalisation of the reward of raw labour is secured by the shifting of its application from one occupation to another; but in our island-

(1) It may be said that the proposition in the text ought to be qualified. The reward of the capitalist (interest) is a function of the prudence shown in saving capital. The recompense of raw labour (wages) is a function of the prudence that restrains the increase of population. The prudential ideas of members of the same society cannot be absolutely disconnected, even in different spheres of prudential action and among different social classes. This is theoretically true, but practically the statement in the text is accurate. The morality of forethought in the way of saving is universally approved, if not universally observed. The morality of forethought in restraint of population is rarely admitted and often condemned.

county there will be one occupation possessing a peculiarity not to be overlooked—I mean the occupation of farming. All lands are not equally good for farming; the produce of the same labour is very different when applied to particular plots, and if, as must be supposed, a man lives on what he gets out of the very worst, he must have a surplus over in cultivating the better qualities. Outside the worst that is cultivated will be a breadth of waste land, not turned to agricultural purposes, and the oscillation of employment in respect of land will alternately trench upon and increase this waste breadth. The measure then of the reward of what I have called raw labour, is to be found in the ratio of produce to labour in the very worst land at any moment under cultivation; other equivalent measures might indeed be suggested, *e.g.* the result of labour on the poorest form of stream, or other elementary fashion of mining, that supports a man; but the best and simplest measure is that I have suggested. One most important truth can be at once deduced from it. The whole population of the county must live on the food got out of the land, and the breadth of land under cultivation must depend upon the magnitude of the population to be sustained. But the reward of labour depends on the breadth under cultivation, and it follows that the reward of labour depends upon the multiplication of the population. We have some warrant, then, for saying that the mass of the community determine for themselves the standard of the existence they lead. Individuals are not indeed always conscious of the laws illustrated by their action; and even when they are conscious of them they may feel that they are personally incapable of modifying their course; but the moral sense of the community grows out of the moral sense of individuals, and the excuse of ignorance disappears when ignorance itself is removed. Another deduction must be pressed home. If it be true that the reward of raw labour—that is to say, the wages of the unskilled workman—is measured by its produce when applied to the worst lands under cultivation, we are brought around to a proposition tentatively advanced before, that the market wages of any piece of work correspond to the labour producing it in the shortest way under the best circumstances accessible to general use, or, in other words, that in a free society the labourer gets what he earns and earns what he gets. The measuring base of a day's wages is what a day's work brings on the roughest land that will yield support to a man; and work is paid for according to the fraction of a day occupied in producing its result in the best (most economical) way it can generally be produced.

You will have observed that I have spoken of raw or unskilled labour, but you will expect to hear something of the wages of skilled labour. Also, when searching out the measuring base of wages, we had to recognise the fact that land is of all degrees of fertility; and that those who had got hold of the best obtained an excess from it

over the cultivator of inferior lands; an excess which often goes to a separate proprietor under the name of rent. Does this appropriation affect the quantity of wages of the poorest? Let us recall our speculations on the origin of capital. We were led to believe that the inventor of capital was a benefactor to those about him, for he reduced the labour necessary to produce desired results, and he thus opened a way to diminish the toil of common life or to increase its quantity, or both these consequences might be partially produced. The facility of obtaining sustenance may be followed by an increase in the community until the old conditions of toil are reproduced, but these conditions cannot be charged against the capitalist: he is not to blame for them; all that he has done is to enable more people to come into existence under them. Now, suppose a man, or a set of men, to be born with exceptional faculties for producing certain results. Their introduction into the community will have the same kind of effect as the introduction of capital; they are a species of labour-saving machines; but here, again, we may suppose an increase of population to follow, so as to bring into occupation below this set of specially gifted workers other workers not so endowed. Competition for the labour of the best will give them exceptional wages; and, indeed, when their labour is directed to the production of commodities, it will be seen materially that they earn exceptional wages, for as they make more things or better things they will get more or better things. But their wages are not got at the expense of their poorer brethren; they have helped to make the existence of those poorer brethren possible, and the *status* of the latter is determined, as we have seen, by the relation of their numbers to the means of existence.

Having thus traced the operation of capital and of special natural gifts, I need not say much of specially educated workmen. It is probable that they have some natural aptitude for the occupations they follow, and they are certainly examples of the investment of capital in the improvement of labour-saving machines. It will follow in their case also that their differentiated wages have grown out of the progress of society, which follows upon the multiplication of capital and the development of skill in the work of life. They are not better paid at the expense of others, whose position is determined on the principles we have already explained. And so also with regard to rent. We have conceived of cultivation extending over a certain breadth of our island-county, and reaching a certain margin where it ceases to support existence; but we can carry back our thoughts, stage by stage, until the cultivated breadth dwindles into a nucleus of what we suppose it to have become. We can indeed see this progress of extended cultivation in activity in the United States and our own colonies, but the distinguishing feature of the phenomenon thus presented to us is that the best knowledge of a highly developed agriculture is brought into immediate contact with virgin

continents. In picturing the extension of cultivation in an isolated Devonshire, we must conceive of a slow development of agriculture accompanying a slow extension of the breadth of cultivated land; and we may imagine each extension as immediately preceding or immediately succeeding a stage of agricultural improvement. I believe that as a matter of history the order has been in England sometimes one way and sometimes the other, but that on the whole the extension of the area of cultivation has oftener followed than preceded agricultural improvements. For my present purpose it is unnecessary to solve this question. Suppose an agricultural improvement to have been made, so that a larger produce is obtained from the same land with the same labour. The toil of the community will be lessened, and the facility of existence improved, but it will now be possible to obtain from the next quality of land hitherto uncultivated, as good an existence as before was obtained from the lowest quality under cultivation; and the result realised may be a larger number of people in the same condition as before, instead of the same number in better condition. If an extension of cultivation preceded agricultural development, the result would be a temporary degradation of condition to be followed by recovery. Whatever the order, the result obtained by those cultivating the newly annexed breadth,—which measures the wages of raw labour,—will not be less because better lands have been previously under cultivation, and a surplus could be obtained from them as compared with the new lands. Rent, in fact, does not diminish the wages of agricultural labour. The existence of rent does not make these wages low; but it may be said that rent exists because these wages are low, the rate of wages being determined, as we have seen, by the relation of the numbers of the people to the land out of which its food is got. Even if the rent which thus arises in the progress of a community were reserved for the separate use of the community, and applied in aid of common wants, this could not of itself arrest the development of population—indeed, it might tend to stimulate it until a still lower margin was reached, the cultivation of which yielded just enough to satisfy the wants which still pressed upon the individual labourer. We return again to the hypothesis, or, as we may now call it, the theorem, that in a free society what a man gets he earns, and what he earns he gets. The wages he receives are—speaking generally—the exact equivalent of the work he performs.

These conclusions have been deduced from an analysis of the development of an imaginary isolated Devon. Can we claim them to be true of the larger social organization of which we are a part? It will be observed that my reasoning has been independent of the limitation of the area we have had under our contemplation. It is plainly convenient to fasten our attention upon a small district. We relieve ourselves from much needless embarrassment occasioned by

the inevitable difficulty of tracing out far-reaching operations, but the principles of the organization of industry and commerce are the same whether the area of its development is large or small. If we reconsider the arguments I have pursued, we shall see that there is only one condition presupposed in them which is affected by an extension of the area of our thoughts. I do not wish to underrate the importance of that condition. It will be seen that it is of very great importance, and yet the modification of it that we may be compelled to recognise does not appear to me to detract from the practical accuracy and value of our conclusions. I have assumed the possibility of the free movement of labour from field to field and from market to market, if not on the part of the labourers actually at work at any moment, yet at least on the part of the generation always coming on to succeed them. This is not strictly true anywhere, and it is very far from being true between labourers of different countries and different races. Differences of language, of law, of religion, of morality, and of manners are very effectual hindrances to the free migration of workmen from one field of labour to another, and they do to some extent, though to a much less extent, impede the interchange of commodities. Even in the same country differences of manners are found to be a great bar to the free competition of labourers. What must be the effect of these admissions on our previous conclusions? They do not invalidate them at all as explanations of the industrial phenomena found within any area where that degree of free movement prevails which we have presupposed. The diversity of condition of the lowest labouring class in districts which are so far isolated that migration from one to the other is practically impeded, is a confirmation of my conclusions. I have said that the economic circumstances of the unskilled labourer depend upon the force of prudence among the labouring classes in keeping down the ratio of population to the means of existence; and if we find districts with comparatively little migration of labour between them, and with different standards of prudence prevailing among their inhabitants, we must infer that there will be corresponding differences of circumstances among their labourers. Conversely, different circumstances among labourers suggest different standards of prudence. Within each circle, the arguments I have used are illustrated in their simplest form, and to those within each circle the moral deduced from those arguments may be addressed. Hence a main explanation of the differences of condition of labourers in different nations. Hence the sufficient and ultimate explanation of the differences of condition of labourers in divisions of the same nation imperfectly fused together. If we pass from Ireland to South-western England, from the South-west to the Midlands, from the Midlands to Northumbria and the Lowlands, we shift from standard to standard of prudence, and from standard to standard of

material circumstances.<sup>1</sup> There is of course movement between all these districts, but the movement of raw labour is relatively small. The miner who can emigrate from Cornwall to Australia or to Nevada, enters with difficulty into the mining population of Durham or Cumberland. The agricultural labourer whom Canon Girdlestone has drafted from Holberton, does not find it easy to adapt himself to the ways of a similar class in the North. And through all the movement that prevails, however much it is, we discern the same principles at work that we have traced; and we are led to the same conclusions—that the conditions of labourers are determined by themselves, that the wages of the workman are the exact equivalent of the work he performs.

If the obstacles which practically permit or retard the free movement of labour do not detract from the value and importance of the principles we have explained, neither does the existence of foreign trade, which we excluded from our conception of an isolated Devon. I hope it is not necessary to enter into any detailed proof of this, though I am strongly tempted to do so, especially when I have in view the strange revival, under the name of a cry for reciprocity, of the foolish theories that once prevailed among us supporting a protectionist policy. But I can only indicate an argument which I have, in principle, already used more than once. Suppose the industrial equilibrium of Devon is disturbed by the arrival of a stranger offering corn at a cheaper rate than it formerly commanded, in exchange for other commodities. The stranger offering corn would wish to take away some other commodity, a metal, work, or what not produced in Devon. He would give more corn for the same weight of metal. The wants of the community in respect of corn would be relieved by less labour, and though the area devoted to the production of corn would be diminished, the production of metal would be increased. The facility of living being increased, the same amount of life could be maintained with more ease, or a greater amount with the same ease. The argument is precisely the same as that which approves the introduction of capital and the invention of labour-saving machines. What is proved of one trade is true of two, three, or any number of successive importations, and in what we eat, what we drink, what we wear, and in the thousand articles of daily use, we must observe the displacement of some rude native commodity by some more convenient and more cheaply produced foreign commodity. We need never be afraid of the quantity of goods coming to us from

(1) The defensible side of the repugnance of the English labourer to the Irish immigrant is that it is a resistance to the introduction of a lower standard of prudence, threatening to debase the condition of all labourers. The same view may be advanced in defence of the opposition to the Chinese immigration in California and Australia, though it is, at the least, doubtful whether the cheaper sustenance of the Chinese labourer should not be attributed to higher progress in the prudential virtues, instead of to a cynical disregard of them.



abroad. They do not come for nothing. Their presence proves the existence of a trade profitable on both sides. Our anxiety must be excited when the quantities of imports and exports both fail, when foreigners are slack to offer us goods because they can get larger exchanges for them elsewhere, and we are forced to accept a dwindling return for what we produce. When that time comes, and I gave you last year reasons for believing that it may, we should only aggravate our trials if we attempted to restrict still further a commerce that was naturally drooping. If we are wise we shall accept with submission the painful experience, we shall recognise the fact that the physical conditions of our manufacturing supremacy are waning, and we shall look, with better sense than ever Canning had, to the new world to redress the balance of the old. Are we not agreed that the quantity of human life any portion of the earth's surface can bear is at all times definite, if not defined, and that the distinction of man from the brutes that perish is that his conduct is overruled by the knowledge of this truth?

Before I finish let me say a few words on the motives which have impelled me in writing this lecture. In the first place, I believe that the views it expresses are true. I do not claim that there is much novelty in them; I do not know that there is any. The form in which the thoughts are clothed may be mine, but the thoughts themselves belong to all the world. Lately, however, men have been heard to declare that these old theories are not true, and their declarations have been received with something like pleasure by not a few. It has not appeared to me that those who have thus come forward to repudiate the ascertained principles of economic science have exercised their patience so far as to study the proofs of the propositions they reject, nor have I found among them many traces of the genius that can dispense with labour. As for those who have caught up and echoed their sayings, I am afraid we must recognise the fact that many persons who are ignorant of many things are easily gratified by the suggestion that the teaching of authority does not deserve the authority it carries with it. The cynicism of superficial knowledge is one of the commonest of every-day facts. It must be admitted also that there is a widespread and almost instinctive repugnance to the reception of economic doctrine. It seems a simple matter to say that a boat cannot be overcrowded without danger of sinking, but is it not cruel to proclaim this truth when so many are desirous of getting on board? We must not be surprised if the self-evident proposition is branded as impious. Truth, however, is truth, and the only plausible argument I have seen advanced against the principles for which I have been contending is that economic relations do not exhaust the relations between man and man. This statement is perfectly sound, but it does not support the purpose for which it is adduced. We know that the health of the human body

is governed by fixed laws. We cannot always trace their operation, but some of them are well ascertained, and it is known that certain causes produce certain results of debility and disease. Benevolence steps in to try to mitigate the pain, to assuage the sufferings, and to arrest the progress of disease; but does this action of benevolence in any way invalidate the truth and authority of the laws of health which had been outraged? Human kindness will try to soften the lot of the unfortunate even when their ill-fortunes are the result of their own recklessness; the prudent will give of the fruit of their labour they have put by to the imprudent who spent all they received even before they received it; but the benevolence that comes to the assistance of an overcrowded population does not weaken the force of the fact that a population in becoming necessarily overcrowded ceases to be self-supporting. This kind of benevolence does no more at its best than try to mitigate evils that have been well developed; there is another and a better kind which would prevent them. I pass to a second motive for calling your attention to what I hold to be true doctrines. Last year I gave you reasons for apprehending a large migration of industrial energy from our own to other lands. I said then, and I repeat now, that I do not look upon the present depression as the beginning of a continuous alienation of trade. Commerce and manufactures will revive, and we may for a season be more prosperous than ever; but the revival will be checked again, and we must look for recurrent periods of depression. If this apprehension is sound, it is above all things necessary that all classes should be prepared for its realisation. There should be a widespread knowledge of the nature of the economic organization of the community, as well as of the causes producing industrial contraction and decline. If our manufacturing supremacy is to be taken from us; if industry after industry may be drawn within narrower limits until they disappear, what is to be the future of the children of the men who now find occupation and the means of existence in pursuing these industries? The only hope of escaping the conflict of classes lies in familiarising the minds of the people with true views of the conditions of social well-being—of the conditions that determine wages and regulate the development of the population. An early conviction that the population that can be sustained in a country at any time lies within a definite limit—a clear recognition of the truth that an able-bodied pauper, a workman in the wrong place, is an indication of an overgrowth—would save us from social conflicts that must otherwise be inevitable and fierce. We may see in Germany attempts to destroy by force the propagation of false views on social relations; but instead of a method always unsatisfactory, if not always unsuccessful, we should try to anticipate error by truth, and thus prevent false views from ever finding acceptance. And if the propositions I have endeavoured to elucidate are truths, and truths

very necessary to be insisted upon at the present time, there is yet another reason why I should try to put them prominently forwards. The doctrines they express are not popular: they cannot easily become popular. It is simpler and pleasanter to believe that our ill-fortunes are due to others, or to circumstances which we cannot modify and choose to call fate, than to be told that our condition is what we and our fellows make it. To preach personal or class responsibility is not a passport to favours; and there is, unfortunately, some reason to suspect that the natural indisposition of men to suggest disagreeable truths is increasing among us. When I look back forty years or thereabouts I seem to detect a contrast not to our advantage as compared with our fathers. In that generation, when mechanics' institutes like yours were first founded, and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge was in the full energy of its early existence, men pursued their inquiries to the end, however ungrateful was the goal they reached. It may be true that there are more things in heaven and earth than were dreamt of in the philosophy of those days, but we shall not cure their incompleteness by attempting to forget what they taught. This is no place for entering upon party politics, and I shall rigidly avoid them, but I may point out to you a consequence of a very popular franchise, that it exposes public men to increasing temptations to give the go-by to unpopular truths. Liberal or Conservative, we cannot afford to say anything that may displease a large section of those whose support we court. We who are Liberals are perhaps under a greater temptation than our opponents to make things soft and pleasant so as to be agreeable to the popular taste. I speak of what I have felt myself, and this feeling has been a motive for choosing the subject on which I have addressed you. Soft words are worse than useless when they disguise facts they cannot change. We are deceived by them into entering upon courses of conduct that can only end in misery. The moral government of the world is as rigorous as its physical government. You might as well hope to build a house in disregard of the law of gravitation, as to secure social well-being in a community where the principle of population is treated as of no account. Without entering upon any argument that could raise a controversy, I may avow my own belief that much yet remains to be done to facilitate the improvement of the condition of the people by the reform of our laws, especially of the laws relating to land; but if all that could be suggested were accomplished, it would still remain with the people themselves to determine their own condition. The changes to which I refer would enable the quantity of existence in the kingdom to be increased, but its quality might be found unimproved after they had been made, just as it might be improved without their being made.

LEONARD COURTNEY.

## THE LIBERAL PARTY AND THE FARMERS.

THE question of the policy of the two great political parties respectively, in relation to the aims and interests of the tenant-farmers, is one of peculiar importance now that we are probably on the eve of a general election. Out of the 283 county members for the United Kingdom 193 are Conservatives, and only 90 Liberals. Of this minority of Liberals the English counties send only 26 against 146 Conservatives; the Welsh counties 7 against 8; the Scotch 16 against 16; while the Irish counties return a majority of 41 Liberals against 23 Conservatives. Nor do these figures give an adequate idea of the extent to which the Conservative preponderance prevails amongst agricultural voters. More than half the 26 Liberal members for English counties represent divisions in which mining or manufacturing industries are extensively carried on. It is also to be borne in mind that the agricultural vote is strong enough to turn a great many borough elections, and it will be found, on inquiry, that in the great majority of such instances in England, Conservatives were returned at the last general election. Since that time the Liberals claim to have vastly improved their organization in the counties, and, in many cases, to have gained considerably on the register; but it would be rash to place much reliance upon these representations. If the principal causes of the great Conservative triumph in the counties remain as they were, there is no reason to expect a widely different result when the next trial of strength between the rival parties comes to be made. It becomes, then, a matter of very serious interest to members of the Liberal party to consider what those principal causes were, to what extent they have been affected by recent events and influences, and how far it is possible to remove them. This may seem at first sight to be merely a question of party ascendancy; but I hope to show that it is one of great importance to the agricultural interest and the nation at large.

Ever since the Reform Bill of 1832 conferred the franchise upon tenant-farmers, a large majority of them, at least in the English counties, have voted with the Conservatives. This preponderance has commonly, and rightly, been attributed chiefly to the fact that the majority of English landlords are Conservatives, and that their tenants have, for various reasons which need not be entered into here, usually voted under their influence. This cause of Conservative ascendancy in the counties, however, would naturally have had less and less effect as the farmers advanced in independence and intelligence, and it was further weakened by the passing of the

Ballot Act. Yet we see that at the last general election, in spite of the ballot, the Conservatives proved to be stronger in the agricultural districts than they had ever been before. There must, therefore, have been other influences than that of subserviency to landlords at work. Another explanation of the prevalent Conservatism of English farmers is that, in addition to their natural disposition to follow, or be driven by, their landlords, they became Conservatives at heart when the great battle over the repeal of the Corn Laws took place, and have remained so ever since. That is, no doubt, also true; but like the first-named influence, its power must have diminished with time, so that we still have the continuance of Conservative preponderance unexplained, to say nothing of its increase. The question of Protection certainly did not exercise any influence upon the last general election, as farmers had long ceased to think its revival possible, even if they wished for it. Family tradition goes a long way in party politics, but obviously cannot account for the phenomena before us, as only a portion of the farmers of the present day are descended from the farmers of 1832. These three influences together—landlord influence, class tradition, and family tradition—might account for a majority of the farmers being Conservatives, or rather voting with the Conservatives, but not for the increase of the majority, or even for its maintenance in its original strength, as all three were acting together in full vigour in 1846, and each has lost some of its power since. Shall we, then, accept the explanation which the Conservatives themselves would offer, namely, that they are actually, as they profess to be, the true farmers' friends? No; for it will be easy to show that the Liberals are the natural allies of the tenants, since the most important of the reforms required by the latter are those which only Liberals can consistently carry out.

The cause of the increase of Conservatism in the counties, as shown at the last general election, was the decided antagonism to farmers that the Liberal party had exhibited throughout their long tenure of power. They have never buried the hatchet drawn in the great Free-Trade fight. They have massed tenants with landlords as making up the "country party," against which they have pitted the party of the towns. The great majority which they had in the last Parliament rendered them disdainful, and they appeared to think they could afford to dispense with the support of the farmers altogether. Not only did they neglect the interests of English and Scotch tenants while they were in power, but some of the leading members of the party seemed to take pleasure in thwarting these men. Mr. Lowe proposed to tax their horses—the working machinery of their industry, and all but laughed them to scorn when they appealed to him to reduce or repeal the malt tax. Mr. Forster constantly showed his hostility by his utter absence of con-

sideration for their interests in the prevention of cattle disease. Mr. Mill, and many with him, denied the justice of compensating men whose cattle were compulsorily killed for the public benefit. Advanced Liberals tried to force on the farmers the utterly impracticable half-time system in relation to education. But there is no need to rake up these disagreeable reminiscences. Every one knows that the farmers were both neglected and snubbed by the great Liberal majority that, whether in or out of office, had held sway for so many years previous to 1874, though none but those who have experienced it can tell how hard it was to be a farmer and a Liberal too during that period. It was no wonder that the Conservatives carried nearly all the English counties when Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country. The only wonder is that there was a Liberal county representative returned in either England, Wales, or Scotland. The Irish tenants had reason to be grateful to Mr. Gladstone, and they alone. If that large section of the farmers who were in favour of the reform of the English and Scotch laws relating to the ownership and tenancy of land, and the right to kill game, naturally had looked to the Liberals as those most likely to carry out their ideas, they had been thoroughly disappointed. They found themselves massed with the really Conservative farmers and the landlords, and like them treated as the foes of Liberals. Thus there seemed not the slightest chance of their grievances being attended to by Mr. Gladstone's party, and the very existence of Liberal farmers seemed to be ignored. No wonder, then, that even they regarded the triumph of the professed farmers' friends with some satisfaction, if they had not helped to secure it. They could not fare worse under the new rulers, and there was some reason to expect that gratitude would induce the Conservatives to do some of the things that, however vaguely, they had promised.

Having thus glanced at the cause of the extraordinary triumph of the Conservatives in the counties at the last general election, let us see whether anything has occurred since to shake their power in those constituencies. If anything of the kind has taken place it has been of their own doing, as their opponents have certainly done nothing to reconcile themselves to the farmers, but have, on the contrary, acted as if bent on widening the breach between them. When Messrs. Howard and Read brought forward their Landlord and Tenant Bill, they found the strongest opposition amongst the Whig landowners who passed for Liberals. This was, I need hardly state, before the last election. Similarly, when the Agricultural Holdings Bill was introduced by the present Government, the most prominent members of the Liberal party in the House of Lords, far from endeavouring to make the measure less imperfect, condemned it altogether as unneeded and unfair to landlords. In the

House of Commons a few advanced Liberals endeavoured to introduce a compulsory clause and some other amendments calculated to make the measure work, but met with no support, either from the bulk of their friends inside the House or from the leading organs of the Liberal press. It has been the same with other attempts at agricultural reform which true Liberals would not fail to support. The languid efforts of the Scotch members to obtain the repeal of the Law of Hypothec, and to reform the Game Laws, have met with either indifference or opposition from the majority of Liberals as well as from Conservatives. But if in respect of agricultural reform generally the Liberals have shown themselves to be either adverse or indifferent, in their dealing with the question of sanitary protection for the magnificent herds and flocks of Great Britain, they have not been content with a vehement opposition to the reasonable desires of the farmers, but have shown an amount of prejudice, unfairness, and discourtesy almost unparalleled in the history of Parliamentary warfare. Here was a question, not whether a certain foreign commodity should be freely imported or not, but whether it should be freely brought here in a safe or in a dangerous form. The proposal to prohibit the importation of live foreign cattle did not emanate in the first instance from stockowners; it was the proposal of the highest veterinary authorities in the country, and was advocated because experience in this and other countries had proved that no measure short of this would render the efforts to get rid of contagious cattle diseases by means of internal restrictions effectual. Our cattle and sheep had been decreasing in number for three years, chiefly because of the great losses and risks caused by the prevalence of disease. Dead meat had been successfully brought from America, and it was chiefly from the utter want of proper means of preserving it for a few days after its arrival that the trade in it was not a complete success. The farmers and their veterinary advisers argued that to encourage home breeding by making it safe against the constant inroads of foreign disease, and at the same time to develop the foreign meat trade, would increase the supply of meat to a greater extent than would the opposite course of discouraging breeding by freely importing live cattle. Surely this was a fair and sensible argument, whether conclusive—as I believe it was—or not, and one entitled to fair and reasonable argument in reply. Instead of that, however, it was received with denunciation, and its advocates were accused of a disingenuous attempt to abrogate Free Trade for their selfish interests. What was demanded simply as sanitary protection was scouted as protection against competition. In vain did the farmers and their representatives, on public platforms and in the press, protest against this imputation. The most prominent Liberal members of the House of Commons and the leading Liberal news-

papers virtually told them that their protestation was only a part of their secret attempt to obtain protection from foreign competition. This was reasonably felt to be an insult of the most unpardonable kind, and it was bitterly resented accordingly.

Let me give one more instance of the unfairness manifested by Liberals in relation to the question of cattle-disease prevention, from the first visitation of cattle plague down to the present time. When the question of compensation to the owners of cattle compulsorily killed to prevent the spreading of disease came up for discussion last session, the old fallacy first made public by the late Mr. Mill was revived. Mr. Mill said that farmers who were compensated were paid twice over; once in the compensation, and a second time in the increase of the value of cattle caused by the diminution of their number. This is an instance of that deductive political economy which has often proved so mischievous. Mr. Mill argued, I presume, on the abstract proposition that the price of a commodity rises in approximate proportion to the decrease of the supply. Now, it is obvious that the application of the proposition, with the view to show that the loss of a certain quantity of a commodity will be compensated for by a rise in the market price of the commodity, will only hold good in the case of a class of producers who have a monopoly, and that even then it only applies collectively, and not individually. But let us test its application to the case of a grazier whose half-fat cattle have been attacked by pleuro-pneumonia. If left alone, he would have the cattle not attacked isolated, and possibly might thus save them from infection. Those actually affected with the disease he would have treated by a veterinary surgeon, and some would be cured. But he is not allowed thus to save the principal portion of his cattle. For the public advantage he is compelled to have them all killed, the carcasses of the diseased beasts being destroyed, and those of the healthy ones sold for what they will make. If ten are destroyed, and ten sold at a sacrifice, it is obvious that the grazier's loss would be a heavy one if he were not compensated, and that it would be unfair to make him thus a sufferer for the public advantage. But, according to Mr. Mill's argument, he would be recouped by a rise in the price of meat; of course, supposing that other graziers had also lost cattle, and that the price actually did rise in consequence. Now, if he has lost all his cattle it is clear that a rise in price is of no advantage to him, as he has to go into the market to buy other cattle to replace those he has lost. But let us imagine a case more favourable to the argument under examination than any at all likely to occur. Suppose the grazier had forty other bullocks beside the twenty killed, the whole sixty being worth £20 each. He sacrifices, say, £5 each on the ten killed (not being completely fattened) and sold, and the whole value on those destroyed,



thus losing £250. Suppose also that, in consequence of the prevalence of the disease, meat rises in price 10 per cent.; then the grazier's forty remaining beasts will be worth £80 more on account of the rise, and this is all the compensation he will obtain. In the case of a breeder the sacrifice might be heavier still, in spite of the fact that it is chiefly breeders who derive advantage from a rise in the price of meat. A breeder whose cattle had been attacked by the disease might be compelled, for the public advantage, to have killed lean stock, very valuable for breeding purposes, but worth little to the butcher.

A more baseless fallacy was never propounded, and it would be surprising that it should have lived so long if we did not take fully into account the highly preservative power of prejudice. It would be as reasonable to argue that, if the Government seized all the rifles in the London gun-shops to send out to the Cape, the shopkeepers would need no compensation from the Government, as they would get it from the rise in the price of rifles; and that for Parliament to vote money to pay for these weapons would be to compensate the shopkeepers twice over. Yet, in spite of the translucency of the fallacy, it was constantly in the mouths of Radical Members of Parliament, and in the leading articles of the Liberal newspapers during the passage of the Cattle Diseases Bill through the two Houses.

I might prolong my indictment against the Liberal party for their treatment of the farmers by going still further into detail; but enough has been stated to show the reason of the increase of Conservatism in the counties, where the farmers influence more votes than their own in number. I must, however, point out, before leaving the subject, how peculiarly adapted the Liberal party in Parliament, as at present constituted, is for estranging the farmers most completely from the Liberal side. The more Liberal section of the farmers most earnestly demand Tenant Right, the alteration of the Land and Game Laws, and really representative county government; in all these demands they find the Whig members of the Liberal party amongst their most vigorous opponents. The more Conservative section of the farmers make local taxation reform paramount, while they agree with their fellows in being very anxious to have sanitary protection for their cattle; these find their bitterest opponents amongst the Radical members. Thus there is nothing of importance that farmers ask for, with respect to which there is not a large portion of the Liberal party against them.

But before pronouncing an opinion upon the probability of an increase or a decrease of Conservative ascendancy in the counties having taken place since the last general election, let us consider for a moment the effect of the Conservatives' own course of action

since they have been in power. Here we shall find that they have been their own worst enemies, while the Liberals have been their best friends—that is, in relation to their popularity amongst the farmers. As the professed “farmers’ friends” it was confidently predicted when they came into office that they would do great things for the agricultural interest. But what have they done? They have given a small relief to the payers of local taxation; they have passed an Agricultural Holdings Act, which is the greatest sham of any important measure of modern times; they introduced a nearly satisfactory Cattle Diseases Bill, and then gave up its vital principle to save their prestige in the towns; they passed a Highways Act which is a puzzle and a nuisance in every county; and they have brought forward County Government and Valuation Bills which were so unpopular among the farmers and other ratepayers, that they had to be withdrawn. In short, they have shown that they will only relieve the farmers’ grievances just so far as will be approved by the landowners, and no further. Local taxation reform is mainly a landlord’s question, and landowners are interested in the prevention of cattle disease, and the better management of highways, as well as tenants. But take any question upon which there is difference of opinion between landlords and tenants, and it will be found that the Government has almost invariably sided with the former. The introduction of the Agricultural Holdings Act was an apparent, if not a real, exception, as a large majority of the landowners objected to any measure of the kind being brought forward. But, having come to the conclusion that a Tenant Right Bill of some kind could no longer with decency be withheld, they introduced one so full of reservations in favour of landlords that tenants would scarcely have cared to come under it if they had been allowed to do so; and, in addition, the bill was made permissive, so that it could be evaded—as it has been almost universally—by the landlords. Then, in the County Government Bill, there was a pretence of giving representation to ratepayers, while, in reality, the power was nearly all reserved to the magistrates who at present wield it. Again, that every wish of the country squire is deferentially attended to by the present Government was conspicuously shown when the first Prisons Bill was dropped. The measure was generally approved by all but the magistrates, who did not like being deprived of their power. Through their objections alone the bill was materially altered before it was passed.

Thus it is abundantly evident that no fundamental reform of agricultural abuses will be undertaken by the Conservatives, unless it be as a counter-bid to the Liberals. Why should it be otherwise? The Conservatives are the landlords, and a privileged class seldom if ever undertakes to set its own house in order, unless with the object of

preventing some one else from meddling with it ; and in the present instance no one threatens to do so. It is this immunity which gives the Conservative party such a fine vantage-ground. The farmers have been disgusted enough with them for the treatment received at their hands ; but what then ? If the Conservatives simply play with the farmers, the Liberals flout them. Instead of a competition between the two parties to gain the support of this numerous and influential body of voters, there has for a long time been a disposition on both sides to treat them with contempt, the only difference being that the Conservatives have attempted to disguise the feeling, while the Liberals have not. It is perfectly true that the farmers themselves are chiefly to blame for being subjected to such treatment, because they have not used their great political power, but have allowed themselves to be partly cajoled and partly driven into selecting landlords to act as their representatives, who, of course, really represent landlords, and not tenants. Still, it must be said on their behalf that the choice of candidates usually offered to them has rested between a Conservative who promised to do a little for them, and a Liberal who promised to do less. It may be suggested that they should choose members of their own body to represent them in Parliament, and undoubtedly it would be well for them to do so as far as possible ; but, it is to be remembered, very few farmers can afford to sit in Parliament or to stand the enormous expense of a county election, and farmers are only like other voters in objecting to subscribe amongst themselves to pay the expenses.

On the whole, I am led to the conclusion that, in spite of their demerits, and in consequence of the conduct of their opponents, the Conservatives, up to the present time, have retained the influence over the farmers which they were proved to possess at the last general election. At the same time, they hold it upon such a very insecure basis, that I am convinced they will lose a considerable portion of it whenever the Liberals come forward in earnest as the reformers of agricultural abuses.

Liberals, I have said, are the natural allies of tenant-farmers. By Liberals I mean men of thoroughly Liberal principles and views, and not the Conservative noblemen and gentlemen who sit on the Opposition side of the House. Unfortunately it is precisely the true Liberals who are most imbued with prejudice against the farmers, because they know them least. It is time that the memories of old feuds should rest, so that Liberals might have the advantage of the large amount of support which they could obtain from agricultural voters, and farmers the championship of men who would be in earnest about the reform of our agricultural system. I do not hesitate to assert that there is no demand made by any considerable section of the tenant-farmers which a true Liberal should object to accede to.

Even the efficient protection of home-bred live stock from disease is, as I have already attempted to show, compatible with Free Trade and real economy, as the increase in the supply of British meat, which the stamping out and keeping out of disease would encourage and secure, would far more than compensate for the small temporary increase of expense incidental to obtaining foreign meat on a safe system. Then as to local taxation, no one can say that it is fair that such new rates as the education rate, for instance, should be saddled on the tenant-farmers in such a large proportion as they are at present. If it is desired to put them on the land, let them be levied on the owners. On no other important question of agricultural politics is there any declared difference between advanced Liberals and those of the farmers who are in favour of a change, and it is only because the former either are false to Liberal principles, or have not the courage of their opinions, that the two are not in alliance. The abolition of the limited ownership of land and the law of primogeniture, the passing of a law securing to tenants the capital expended on the land by them, the repeal or thorough reform of the Game Laws, and the abolition of Agricultural Distress and Hypothec—all these are objects which true Liberals as a body are in favour of. Then why not boldly say so? Why not make these reforms prominent in the Liberal programme? The party is in want of a policy, or at least of a home policy. Then let it take Free Agriculture for its watch-word.

It will be objected that to adopt this suggestion would be to divide the Liberal party. No doubt it would be; but the Liberal party can only be united by being divided. It is just now a non-descript body, without distinct aims, and without even a reason for existence beyond that of preventing the Conservatives from doing mischief—an object in which it has lamentably failed. With the doubtful exception of foreign politics, the Liberal party, as at present constituted, has no distinct set of objects in view which can excite the enthusiasm of its most devoted followers. The Conservatives are better situated. They can appeal to the enthusiasm of selfishness, the strongest passion of human nature. Their leading constituents have class privileges to uphold, and the *esprit de corps* is consequently exceedingly strong amongst them. For the rest, there are the fear of revolutionary changes and the *vis inertiae* to keep them faithful. When Liberals have no policy calculated to rouse a generous and enlightened enthusiasm amongst the people, they must stand at a tremendous disadvantage with such forces as these to contend against.

Is there any object, or set of objects, in the whole field of home politics half so important as the reform of our abominable land system? Is there any possible triumph so worthy of the old

prestige of the Liberal party as the attainment of that object would be? Is there any crusade so well adapted to yield fruition to the noblest ambition of statesmen? If we look merely at expediency, is there any policy that would attract so large a following amongst all classes of the people as the one in question? A large majority of the town population, a considerable proportion of the tenant-farmers, and the agricultural labourers, who will soon have the franchise, would welcome such a policy with joy. Nor could there well be a more favourable time for adopting it than the present. An agricultural crisis of almost unprecedented extension and severity is upon us, and the whole country is suffering from it in a degree not commonly recognised. The farmers are earnestly looking for some means of salvation from the ruin which threatens to overtake them. The farm labourers are feeling the depression in the slackness of employment and the sinking of wages; and they, it should be considered, will for the most part vote as their employers tell them, when they have votes to give, if there be not placed before them some objects in which they can feel an interest. In this connection, moreover, it is impossible to attach too much importance to the need of placing fair and reasonable schemes of land tenure reform before this large class of people, by way of antidotes to the wild and unjust proposals that have been made by men who put themselves forward as their leaders. Similarly, it may be urged that farmers require to be encouraged to pursue the right track of agricultural reform, as a counter-attraction to the specious enticements of the neo-protectionists, now courting their support. The opportuneness of such a declaration of policy as the Liberals are now urged to make is further shown by the consideration that, as far as can be judged from the Ministerial statement, their opponents have no present intention of dealing with any agricultural grievances of the first importance. With respect to the people generally, outside the agricultural classes, there has long existed a smouldering discontent with our land system, which only needs to be fanned into a flame. The subject has been sadly neglected by their leaders and by the Press, at least as far as definite plans of reform are concerned. They have not even been shown with any approach to completeness how materially their interests are affected by the dead-lock which enfolds our whole agricultural system. A few specialists have dealt with the subject in a more or less satisfactory manner; but their writings have had only a limited circulation. The papers which lead public opinion have never discussed the topic in anything like a systematic manner. An attempt to deal exhaustively with such a great subject would be quite beyond the scope of an article like this; but a few considerations may be briefly set down by way of support to my contention that the policy which I recommended might easily be made a popular one.

In a paper published in the February number of this Review the principal impediments to agricultural development were named, the further consideration of the effects of removing these hindrances being left for a future occasion. It had been shown that our agriculture is threatened with a permanent decline, from which nothing short of a fundamental reform of our land system can save us. The popular discontent with that system has hitherto chiefly taken the forms of grumbling at the monopoly of the great landowners, and the consequent difficulty of obtaining plots of land for building and other purposes, and a misplaced sympathy with poachers, as if they were the real victims of the Game Laws. There has also been much complaint of the existence of vast tracts of uncultivated land, used as deer forests, coverts for small game, or simply neglected as waste. Now the difficulty and costliness of obtaining land, especially in small plots, is a serious inconvenience ; but it is only a small portion of the evil worked by land entail and settlement. The effects of the Game Laws upon the morals of the people are lamentable ; but their mischief is still more seriously felt in the enormous waste and deprivation which they cause to the whole nation. The loss of land that might be made fruitful under favourable conditions of tenure is a matter of great importance ; but it is less disadvantageous than the half-cultivation of the soil which is at present under tillage or in pasture. Our whole land system, from beginning to end, is one tending to the impoverishment of landlords, tenants, labourers, and consumers alike, and it is one of the most striking evidences of the indomitable energy and enterprise of the Anglo-Saxon race that British farming has, under such monstrous disadvantages, advanced to even its present state of comparative excellence. More than three-fourths of our land is owned by men who lose instead of gain by spending money on its improvement, even if they have the necessary capital, which very few of them possess ; and it is cultivated by tenants who can only improve at the risk of having their capital confiscated, and, in many cases, with the danger of having its produce destroyed by game. The limited owner must, in justice to his younger children, or other relatives as distinct from the heir, get all he can out of his estate, and spend as little as possible upon it. If he is one of the few who would take the trouble to improve without any advantage to himself, he finds it impossible to do so without a sacrifice either to himself or his successor. He may borrow money and charge it to the estate ; but if he goes to a land company he finds their charges high and their conditions vexatious. He can only improve in their way, and not in his own, and he has to pay a commission which, of course, is a dead loss to him or his successor, as it is money paid beyond interest on the capital spent in improvements that may yield a satisfactory return. As compared with a proprietor

who spends his own money on his land, such a man is at a very great disadvantage, and it is no wonder that very few limited owners do much to improve their estates. The disabilities of the tenant-farmer are similar. If the limited owner cannot spend money because all the benefit would go to his heir, the tenant cannot spend it without serious risk because the advantage might go entirely or partly to his landlord. He is often further deterred from investing money by the ravages of game, and by restrictive covenants. Thus agricultural enterprise is kept at a low ebb, and it is easy to imagine how the welfare of the farm labourer and the consumer is injured. We want concentrated ownership and tenancy alike to develop the resources of the soil, and our present system is one of overspread ownership and tenancy. The landlord has more land than he can do justice to with his own capital, and the much-needed farm buildings, drains, and other improvements, so strikingly lacking on most estates, are left unprovided in consequence. The tenant dares not do the best he can with a small farm, and so takes a large one to get what he can out of it by indifferent husbandry. Thus commonly he gets into difficulties, has to borrow capital at high interest, and is a struggling man and a poor farmer for the rest of his life. Instead of a temptation to take more land than his capital will make him complete master of, the farmer needs every inducement in the opposite direction, as the natural tendency of men to do business in a large way is only too strong, without artificial stimulants being added.

There are, of course, many exceptions to the general run of owners and tenants as above described. There are landlords who improve their estates, and farmers who cultivate their farms well. English landlords, as a class (I cannot say *British*), are not conspicuous for avarice; if they were, they would not uphold a system under which they are such heavy losers in a pecuniary sense. They care more for dignity, political ascendancy, and family ambition, than for money. Therefore many of them have not taken the full advantage of the unfair privilege of confiscating their tenants' capital, which the law confers upon them. Trusting to this forbearance, many tenants have risked their capital in high farming, and have gained by their courage. But capital does not freely flow in such risky channels. I am writing of a general system and its common results, and it is no exaggeration to describe our English land system as pauperising in its tendency from beginning to end. It is to be feared that we have yet to wait to see the worst of its results; but already they are sufficiently distressing. A large number of the landowners are in embarrassed circumstances, and those who are best acquainted with the position of tenants declare the belief that not one in ten could pay twenty shillings in the

pound if put to the test at the present time. Unless a remedy is applied there must be a great crash.

Let our land system be altered so that its tendency will be completely reversed, and it is only reasonable to expect opposite results. Let the laws encourage embarrassed landowners to sell, instead of encouraging them to hold; facilitate and cheapen transfer, instead of rendering it difficult and costly; secure invested capital to tenants, instead of making such expenditure a risky game of chance; and place owners and occupiers on a fair footing towards each other, instead of giving the former in various ways the advantage: let our laws be framed to act thus, and the agriculture of this kingdom will not only arise from its present state of depression, but will advance to a perfection that the world has never seen.

If it be objected that something beyond vague generalities is needed to bring home to the minds of the people at large the advantage to be derived from the reform of our land system, let us take an estimate of Mr. Caird's by way of illustration. That gentleman, in his essay on "British Agriculture," recently published in the Royal Agricultural Society's Journal, and in a separate volume, estimates the value of the annual agricultural produce of the British Isles at £260,737,500. Some high authorities have expressed their belief that this produce might be doubled under the most favourable conditions of farming, and I believe that in time that magnificent result might be attained if our agriculture were completely freed from its present state of enthrallment. The effects of such a consummation upon the welfare of the nation it would be impossible to describe. Still, imagination may vaguely picture the striking contrast between so enormous an increase in our production on the one hand and its probable decrease by at least one-fourth on the other. In a preceding paper, already referred to, I gave reasons to show that nothing but the enfranchisement of our agriculture can save it from a permanent decline, and it is no exaggeration to estimate the probable extent of that decline at one-fourth of what has hitherto been the average value of our agricultural produce. Such a decrease in production would be equivalent to the perpetuation in an exaggerated degree of the depression which at the present time is felt throughout the country in all branches of industry and commerce.

The extent to which the agricultural failure of the past three years is accountable for the general depression appears to have been very generally ignored. We hear a great deal of the results of foreign competition, and very little of that dead loss to the wealth of the country which a falling off of agricultural production undoubtedly is. Our home trade has suffered far more seriously than our foreign trade, and the deficiency of farm produce is alone almost sufficient to account for the slackness of the home trade. It is probably quite



within the mark to compute the agricultural deficiency of the past three years at £30,000,000 annually. In Scotland alone, for each of the past two years, it has been estimated at £10,000,000. This serious falling off has been partly due to deficient harvests and partly to foreign competition ; but there is a very general conviction amongst farmers that, even with seasons of average fertility, they will not be able to hold their own against the world under the existing conditions of farming. We have here, then, a question of the very highest national importance, and one that urgently demands the careful consideration of the people at large. That they will be obliged to give it their serious thought before long I have not the slightest doubt ; but in the meantime an enormous amount of mischief may be done that it will require many years to repair. It is in the hope of calling the immediate attention of statesmen and thoughtful politicians to the subject that this paper has been written, and my appeal is made to the members of the Liberal party because their principles and their traditions show that they are best fitted to deal with it effectively. It is no matter for half-measures. These have been tried and found useless. What is wanted is Free Agriculture, and the men who shall prove themselves worthy and able to give that to this country will earn an even higher title to the gratitude and esteem of their fellow men than that of those who gave us Free Trade.

WILLIAM E. BEAR.

## BLACK AND WHITE IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.

DURING a recent tour in the United States I was particularly anxious to obtain information regarding the relation of the black and white races, not only because the subject is in itself of immense interest to commerce and humanity, but because it is of special interest to ourselves, called on to deal with masses of the black race in South Africa, and the possessors of many lands in which white and coloured races are intermingled. In some of our colonies it has been supposed that the free Negro has shown a great indisposition to labour. On the other hand, cotton, the great staple of the Southern States, and formerly almost entirely raised by slave labour, has been produced in larger quantity since emancipation than ever it was before. How, I sought to know, has that been managed, political disturbances and difficulties notwithstanding ?

As regards political questions, too, I am much impressed with the belief that our management of territories where white and black races are intermixed has not always been successful. An oligarchical system of government generally prevails in our tropical colonies, under which considerable injustice has, I think, sometimes been done to the East Indian labourers imported to take the place of the emancipated Negroes. Except in the Cape Colony proper, no political representation has been allowed to the coloured races. I was, then, very anxious to see the effect of the political emancipation of the Negroes in the Southern States of the Union.

In the course of my tour I have had opportunities of conversing with many men of many classes (and quite as much on one side of politics as the other) who have had the greatest experience of the blacks in various aspects—educational, industrial, political, and other. I am indebted to them for information given to me with a freedom, frankness, and liberality for which I cannot be sufficiently grateful; to none more so than to many Southern gentlemen who have gone through all the bitternesses of a great war on the losing side and the social revolution which followed—men whose good temper and fairness of statement, after all that has passed, commanded my admiration. I have visited not only the towns but the rural districts of four of the principal States formerly slave-holding, viz. Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; and it so happened that I was in South Carolina (the *ne plus ultra* of Southernism) on the day of the late general election. I have seen and conversed with the Negroes in their homes and in their fields, in factories, in churches, and in political meetings, and I think I have also been

able to learn something of a very prominent part of the population—the Negresses. I feel that a single tour must still leave much to be learned, but I have honestly weighed and compared all the information I have obtained from different sources, and submit the general result for what it may be worth. If my conclusions do not in themselves carry much weight, I hope that I may perhaps succeed in indicating some points worthy of inquiry and discussion.

#### THE CHARACTER AND CAPACITY OF THE NEGRO.

The first and most difficult question is the capacity of the Negro as compared to other races. In one sense all men are born equal before God; but no one supposes that the capacities of all men are equal, or that the capacities of all races are equal, any more than the capacities of all breeds of cattle or dogs, which we know differ widely. There is, therefore, no *prima facie* improbability of a difference of capacity between the white Aryan and the Negro race, though I believe there is no ground for presuming that white races *must be* better than black.

It is unnecessary to try to distinguish between differences due to unassisted nature and those due to domestication and education. No doubt the varieties of wild animals found in different countries differ considerably; but the differences due to cultivation seem to be still more prominent in the animals and plants with which we are best acquainted. It is enough to take the Negro as he is, and his history and surroundings need only be briefly glanced at in so far as they afford some key to his present position and immediate prospects.

The Negro race now in America is derived from an admixture of people of various African tribes, probably differing considerably among themselves, but all, it may be assumed, in a more or less savage and little civilised condition. They have all passed two or three generations in slavery to white men, during which period all traces of their various origin have been lost, as well as their original languages and habits. And now, though variety of breed affecting their capacity may still to some degree be present if we could trace it, I believe that it is impossible to do so, and that we must deal with them as a single English-speaking people. They are also now all Christians; and though some African traditions may linger among them, they have for the most part adopted the dress and manners of their white masters, and have been greatly civilised. In this latter respect there is, however, a considerable distinction. One portion of the Negroes have lived in parts of the country where the white population was numerous—equal to or more numerous than the blacks—and thus, working among and in very intimate contact with white people, have very thoroughly learned their ways, habits, and ideas. But there is a broad belt round the outer

portion of the Southern States where the climate is very injurious to the white man, and almost impossible to the ordinary white labourer. In this tract, containing much of the most productive country, the whole labouring population was and is Negro, the few white men being, in slave times, only the masters and drivers, and in no degree the comrades of the blacks. In these tracts we have a thick population not so completely converted. Their language is still to some degree a sort of pigeon or negro English, and they are still to some extent a peculiar people, perhaps less good workers than those more thoroughly educated by contact with whites, but probably as a rule more simple and docile. It should be noticed, however, that considerable migrations have taken place in the troubles consequent on the war, and that there has been some intermixture of the two classes.

At the time of emancipation the Negroes were destitute of education to an excessive degree. Not only were means of education wanting to them, but after some local troubles which alarmed the masters, most of the Southern States passed laws making it highly penal to educate a Negro. These laws endured to the last, and under them the generation upon whom emancipation came grew up entirely without instruction. The only educated persons of the race were the few free blacks who had obtained instruction in the North, and a very few favourite domestic slaves whom their mistresses had to some degree educated, the penal laws notwithstanding. Since emancipation a good deal has been done to educate the Negro. Many schools in which a superior education is afforded have been maintained by benevolent Northerners, and the State Governments have set up, and continue to maintain, several colleges in which the more ambitious and aspiring young blacks are educated. For the education of the masses a public school system has been started in all the States, of which the blacks have a fair share. Owing, however, to financial difficulties these schools are extremely imperfect, being open but a small portion of each year—in some States as little as two months, and in none, I believe, more than about four months on an average. However, this is better than nothing. The Negroes show a laudable zeal for education, and upon the whole I think that as much has been done as could be expected under the circumstances.

During the last dozen years the Negroes have had a very large share of political education. Considering the troubles and the ups and downs that they have gone through, it is, I think, wonderful how beneficial this education has been to them, and how much these people, so lately in the most debased condition of slavery, have acquired independent ideas, and, far from lapsing into anarchy, have become citizens with ideas of law and property and order. The white serfs of European countries took hundreds of years to rise to

the level which these Negroes have attained in a dozen. Such has been the thoroughness of the measures adopted in America.

Another education has, I think, greatly affected the character and self-reliance of the Negroes. I mean what I may call their religious education. Like most primitive races (the aborigines of India for instance) they are inclined to take Christianity in a more literal sense than their more civilised fellow-Christians, who have managed to explain most of it away to their own satisfaction. And these Negroes are by temperament extremely religious people of an emotional type. They like to go direct to God himself, and are quite unwilling to submit to priests claiming to stand between them and God. Hence it is that the Catholic hierarchy has had no success with them and probably never will have. Every man and woman likes to be himself or herself an active member of the Church. And though their preachers are in a great degree their leaders, these preachers are chosen by the people from the people, under a system for the most part congregational, and are rather preachers because they are leaders than leaders because they are preachers. In this matter of religion the Negroes have utterly emancipated themselves from all white guidance—they have their own churches and their own preachers, all coloured men—and the share they take in the self-government of their Churches really is a very important education. The preachers to our eyes may seem peculiar. American orators somewhat exaggerate and emphasize our style, and the black preachers somewhat exaggerate the American style; but on the whole I felt considerably edified by them; they come to the point in a way that is refreshing after some sermons that one has heard. I did not witness any of the more active emotions in which I understand congregations sometimes indulge; but the practice of emitting in a hearty way a sort of responses here and there during the sermon seemed to me earnest and not unbecoming. I witnessed a convention of Baptist ministers (the blacks generally are Baptists or Methodists), in a rural church, and it was a pleasant sight. The ministers by no means had it all their own way. The whole country side seemed to have come in to assist, both men and women—and they seemed to be making a time of it—camped about for the day.

The prominent position taken by the Negro women is a feature in which they are distinguished from some Oriental races. No doubt this has some advantages, but also I shall have to note some attendant disadvantages—social, industrial, and political. In matters matrimonial the women are somewhat too independent and light-hearted; and the men also being on this subject given to a rather loose philosophy, the marital tie is not so binding and indissoluble as it might be. Those who take an unfavourable view of the Negro character are in the habit of speaking of these traits of their cha-

racter in severe language, and dwelling much on their immorality and want of family affection. I think, however, that it is scarcely fair to judge them by too high a standard. The truth is that the Aryan family has hardly yet established itself among the Negroes, and it is not surprising that this should be so. In Africa we know that nothing of the kind exists; there, no doubt, the progenitors of the American blacks lived under the loose polygamistic system still prevailing there. Under slavery the family could not be introduced—it was impossible that there could be much permanency of marital arrangements when the parties were constantly liable to be, and very frequently were, sold away like cattle; and the relation between parent and child was especially weakened or rather not created. The parents were not really responsible for the children; on the contrary, the women were sent to work, and the children were carefully tended by persons appointed by the masters for the purpose, like calves or lambs or any other valuable stock. Parents had little affection for children thus reared, and children owed no respect and obedience to parents. The family as we know it is, in fact, a novelty to the Negro since emancipation, and such institutions are not perfected in a day. Still the evil is a very grave one, especially in regard to the relations between parents and children. I have heard many authentic stories of children who have deserted or neglected their parents in a shocking manner, and the more than American liberty of the children threatens to render the next generation less tractable and useful than their fathers bred in slavery. We can only hope that time and religious influences will more completely establish the family system. Though the exceptions are many, there seems already to be much that is good and kind in the relations of the blacks to one another. If in some respects, other than marital, the women are rather troublesome, it seems that in this as in other things they have rather exaggerated American ways, than set up ways of their own. Seeing the liberty, equality, and privileges enjoyed by the free white women, the Negro women insist that their position among their own race shall not be inferior.

One great difficulty in estimating the qualities of the Negro race as tested by education, &c., is, that since under the American system all who have any share of black blood are classed with blacks, a large proportion of those who have received the most education in former days, and who most frequently become known as prominent coloured men, are Mulattos of mixed blood: so, in fact, are many of the students in the higher schools. Whatever the qualities of those whose blood is mixed in various degrees, they are evidently no safe index of the Negro qualities and capacities, and it is necessary to be constantly on one's guard on this point when one generalises from experience of individuals.

As respects the Mulattos there is much disposition to disparage them; but I am inclined to think that this is in great part due to their peculiar position—they are rejected from all the society of the whites, and have not been accepted by the blacks as their natural leaders. The same tone of disparagement has generally been adopted regarding the Eurasians, the people of mixed blood in India; yet I believe their failure is more due to an unfortunate position than to want of effective qualities. In early days Skinners and Gardeners were men of great mark, and the Eurasian drummer-boys of the old sepoy regiments were physically fine men and good athletes. I understand that in the New Orleans country under the French practice (which has not our Anglo-Saxon antipathy to intimacy with coloured races), many creoles of mixed blood attained a far higher position than in other parts of the United States.

Reverting now to the capacities of the Negro proper as we find him in America under the circumstances which I have described, the general opinion of those engaged in the education of the race is that while the younger children are as quick and bright as white children, they do on the average fall off in some degree as they get older. Yet this opinion is not given without some consideration and qualification; the intellectual gulf between the two races does not seem to be very wide and evident. I am told on all hands that some pure Negroes show an educational capacity quite equal to that of good whites. Nothing is more difficult than to estimate accurately qualities of this kind, especially when, as in this case, the two classes are not taught together but separately; and there has not yet been time to see much of the results of educating the blacks on a large scale; but I think that in general terms the direction in which all experience points is that which I have stated, viz. that on the whole they are behind, but not very far behind.

When we look to practical success in life, appearances seem at first sight less favourable to the blacks. I constantly asked, Have any individuals among them come to the front and achieved success in industrial pursuits, in commerce, or in the professions? and I could not learn that they have. There were, I said, before the war a number of free blacks, many of them educated; have none of them distinguished themselves in practical life? And since emancipation the Negroes have for years had the upper hand in some of the Southern States; have none of them come to the front among their own race by the process of natural selection which has raised men to greatness in barbarous and Oriental countries? Well, as I have already mentioned, they have shown some capacity as preachers, and they seem to have some talent for oratory (though I believe that Frederick Douglas and one or two other well-known men are Mulattos, not real Negroes). As politicians some of them have done fairly well,

and are now good and popular representatives of their race; but I don't think any of them have made a great mark. The politics of the Southern States while Negro majorities prevailed, seem to have been in reality entirely under the guidance of the white Carpet-baggers.

For the rest, I have not been able to hear of a successful Negro merchant—the shopkeeping business in the most Negro districts is almost entirely in the hands of whites. I have scarcely found a Negro who has risen in the mercantile world higher than an apple-stall in a market. Certain professions they almost monopolise throughout the Union—waiters and barbers, and in some parts ship-caulkers; but I found very few Negro lawyers, and no doctors. All over the world it is curious to notice how ready people are to entrust the care of their souls to very unsafe home-rulers, and how much less trustful they are of their bodies.

When I have put these failures to the friends of the Negroes, they reply that allowance must be made for very great disadvantages—even in the North they say, the free Negroes were subjected to a social ostracism which made their success in commerce and the professions almost impossible. And as regards the South, they say, since emancipation how short a time has elapsed—people enslaved and denied education cannot rise in a day. In all this there is much truth. Still I cannot help thinking that if the race had been a very pushing and capable one, the men educated in the North would ere this have made more way in the South. Do you think, I have said, that if they had been Chinamen they would not in spite of all these disadvantages have found their way to the front in some directions? I think it is admitted that to some extent this is so. The Negroes are certainly not a race remarkable for energy and force under difficulties. The only question is whether they are very deficient in these qualities. As respects mercantile qualities, we may remember that there are many excellent races who show no aptitude that way, and permit alien races to usurp the mercantile functions. In the Southern States the white Americans themselves are very much ousted from the business of small store-keepers by the Germans, who are to the manner born.

What is more disappointing is the failure of the Negroes, so far, as superior artisans and in all that requires accuracy and care. As it is expressed, they are not *responsible*—they cannot be depended on. In slavery times some of them were pretty good artisans, and many of them, in the South, are now fairly good carpenters, bricklayers, and blacksmiths. But they seem hardly to have progressed in this respect since emancipation. A man who will do his carpentry so far well enough, will not fit the pieces accurately; and in factories which employ black labour, they do not rise to the



higher posts. In the North the trades-unions are so strong, and the jealousy of the Negroes on the part of foreigners, Irish and others, is so great, that they would not have a fair chance: but in the South they labour under no such disadvantage, and employers rather prefer Negro labour; yet in practice they don't seem to be able to trust the blacks beyond a certain point. In mechanical shops the blacks do the manual labour, but are hardly trusted to work engines. "Perhaps a Negro might learn to work the engine," an employer said to me, "but I never could be sure that he would not go to sleep on the top of it." In tobacco factories the labour is almost exclusively Negro, and many of them are very well paid for labour requiring considerable skill; but I noticed that for certain work, the weighing and making up the packages and such like, white men were always employed. I was in all these cases assured that no black man could be trusted to be accurate. Yet they make very fair cotton-farmers, and much of their handiwork in various branches of industry is quite good.

On the whole, I think it must be considered that at present, whether from natural defects or from want of cultivation, they are to a certain extent inferior to white men in the qualities which lead to the higher grades of employment. On the other hand, they have a very remarkable good nature and good temper, much docility, and great physical power and endurance, qualities that admirably fit them for labourers. Considering from how low and oppressed a condition they have been lately raised, and how infinitely higher their position now is, it is hardly ground for disappointment that they do not immediately rise in large numbers to the higher grades of society. They have now opportunities of education which will enable them to rise if they are fitted, or when they are fitted for it. For the present we may deal with them in their existing position as the labouring population of the Southern States.

#### THE NEGROES AS A LABOURING POPULATION.

To understand the relations between the whites of the South and the blacks as labourers and farmers, we must go back a little. In later slave times, in the States at least to which my inquiries were chiefly directed, the slaves were not worked out like omnibus horses; in fact the capital sunk in slaves was so heavy, and produce had become so cheap, that the principal source of profit was what was called the "increase" of the slaves—the breeding them for the market, or for new plantations opened in the more Western States. As in breeding farms for other kinds of stock, the human stock was carefully, and, on the whole, kindly treated; and although the selling off the young stock as it became fit for the market was a barbarous process, still being so weak as I have described,

those who remained did not feel it so much as we should ; and I think it may be said that the relations between the masters and the slaves were generally not unkindly. One old gentleman in Carolina dwelt much on the kindness and success with which he had treated his slaves, adding as the proof and the moral that they had doubled in twenty years.

Then it must be remembered that in all the older States the whole of the land was private property—there was no unowned land available to squatters—and through all the political troubles the rights of property have been maintained inviolate ; neither by mob violence nor by class laws have they been interfered with. In some limited portions of the Southern States, occupied early in the war by United States' troops, a good deal of the property of absent secessionists was sold for non-payment of taxes in a way which the Southerners call confiscation, but this was done by the authority of the United States Government. The Carpet-bagger and Negro State Governments and Legislatures never seriously infringed on the rights of property.

After the war the Southerners accepted the situation as few but Americans can accept a defeat, and, instead of throwing up their hands and crying to heaven, sought to make the best of the lands that remained to them. It seemed not impossible that, the property in slaves being written off as lost, the land might be as cheaply and effectively cultivated by hired labour, if the Negroes could be got to work ; at any rate it was a necessity to get it cultivated somehow. The Negroes on the other hand found that they must work or starve, and the feeling between them and their former masters being, as I have said, not unfriendly, the matter was arranged in one way or another.

Under the old system there were no great estates in the English sense—that is, very large properties let to tenants. The large plantations were what we should call large farms, several hundred acres—up to, say, a thousand or fifteen hundred—being cultivated by the owner with slave labour. Both some of the old owners, and some Northerners and Englishmen who purchased encumbered estates at a cheap rate, at first tried to maintain this system with hired labour, but the result has been to show that, as in almost all the States of the Union, large farming does not pay as well as small farming, and consequently the large farms have for the most part been broken up or let to small farmers.

There is a general concurrence of opinion, and not of opinion only, but of the most practical experience, that the blacks make admirable labourers when they are under sufficient supervision. On public works, and all undertakings carried on under professional superintendence, nothing can be better or more effective than their labour.

They are physically exceedingly fine men ; they stand any climate and any weather, and are quite ready to do a good day's work for a moderate day's pay, provided it is fairly and regularly paid. I heard of no case in which when such work has been offered to them they have preferred to squat down in idleness ; that allegation against the Negro character seems to me quite disproved by experience. The worst said is that they cannot always be depended on, and sometimes after labouring for a time will go off for a time. There may be some cases in which, work not being readily available, and little assistance or guidance forthcoming, they have sunk into a somewhat degraded condition, but such cases are quite rare and exceptional. I came across none, though I have heard it asserted that there are such. On small farms where black men work in small numbers, in company with and under the immediate control of their employers, they do exceedingly well ; also when they work on their own account they do very well. It is only where they are employed in large numbers, under insufficient supervision, as on very large farms, that they are apt to take it easy and idle away their time, as is the case with most such races.

Not only is the Negro labour excellent, but also there is among the Southern proprietors and leading men accustomed to black labour and not so used to whites, a disposition greatly to rely on black labour as a conservative element, securing them against the dangers and difficulties which they see arising from the combinations and violence of the white labourers in some of the Northern States, and on this ground the blacks are cherished and protected by democratic statesmen who now hold power in the South.

As in other parts of America, wages are not so high as they were ; but a common Negro labourer in rural districts can generally earn about fifty cents, say two shillings a day, and that with food so cheap as it is, and in a country which requires little fuel and no very expensive shelter, is a very good wage. Nothing so much brings home to me the poverty and lowness of living of our Indian population as to hear these wages talked of as low ; being, as they are, six or eight times the wages of a coolie in India, while food is scarcely, if at all, dearer. In truth, the Negroes are very well off.

More important than the rate of wages is the question whether the black labourers show any disposition to providence and saving. There is a good deal of discrepancy in the evidence on this subject, but on the whole I am afraid it must be said that the balance of evidence is decidedly against them. It seems pretty clear that providence is as yet the exception, and that the rule is a light-hearted way of spending their money as they get it. A very great scandal and evil was the failure of the Freedman's Bank, in which so many were induced to put their savings in the days of high

wages. I suspect that in the case of the Negro, as of other races, prudence will not come but with the growth of desires and ambitions only to be satisfied by saving.

In some parts of the country there has been a considerable lack of female labour. In slave days women were probably worked too much; now they sometimes work too little, because, in the parts where they are much mixed with whites, the Negro women, seeing that the white women do not work in the fields, and being, more than the men, inclined to assert equality, refuse out-door work. I have no sympathy whatever with the sentimental feeling which would stigmatise the field labour of honest Scotch or German women as degrading, and I do not sympathize with Negro ladies who make their husbands work while they enjoy the sweets of emancipation. But after all they are only following the most usual American fashion in regard to out-door labour; and both in the more Negro parts of the country at all times, on their own farms at cotton-picking seasons, and everywhere at in-door labour, the Negro women work well enough.

I inquired whether the black labourers have shown any disposition to violent outbreaks such as have occurred in several West India islands, but I could only hear of one such case, when the hired labourers in some of the rice-plantations of South Carolina struck for wages, and used much violence towards non-strikers, hunting them about with whips. The whites attempting to apprehend the rioters were mobbed, and the affair at one time looked very serious; but by the aid of influential black politicians the matter was accommodated, and the labourers have since worked well and quietly. I am told that though in their immediate demands the blacks were in the wrong, they had much ground of complaint, owing to the practice of some of the employers who, not being able to pay the wages earned and due, put the labourers off with cheques upon stores kept on the truck principle. So here, also, there was some injustice at the bottom of the affair. But it shows that when stirred up there is always this element of excitability and potential violence in the Negro character. Here, also, I understand the women came to the front. The men might have been managed, but the women were terribly violent.

The great majority, I take it, of the Negroes are not employed on regular wages, but work more or less as farmers of a sort. Not only are large farms generally unsuccessful in America, but in the South there is very great deficiency of capital to work such farms; and so it has come about that most of the land is cultivated on a sort of co-operative or Metayer-tenant system. Virginia still contains a large Negro population, and I saw one instance of a large estate still successfully cultivated by hired black labour, under a proprietor well

known for his kind treatment of the Negroes: but others doubt his profits, and say that his success is due to large private means, and that there are not many such instances. In fact, Virginia, not being a cotton state, is somewhat unfortunately situated. The influx of cheap cereals from the West makes their culture in the East unprofitable, and in the culture of its old staple, tobacco, Virginia has been surpassed by some more Western States. Except in the higher tracts in the west of the State, where excellent pastures support very fine cattle, I am afraid it is not very prosperous.

From North Carolina, all the way round to Texas, there is a belt of states in which cotton is to an overwhelming degree the staple. That staple is certainly now produced in greater quantity than ever it was, and it cannot be said that this tract has in any degree receded or ceased to progress, even though the want of money resulting from the war and its consequences is still very greatly felt. The cotton I speak of is the ordinary short cotton which always has formed the great bulk of the American crop. There is a narrow belt on the sea-coast, which used to produce in part the long or sea-island cotton and in part rice, where there has certainly been a great falling off; but this is, I believe, chiefly due to other causes than the emancipation of the slaves. The long-cotton plant produces but a fraction of the quantity that the ordinary cotton yields, and requires a more expensive and careful cultivation. It never could be produced at a profit except at a price several times greater than that of ordinary cotton. Now that Egyptian cotton to a great degree supplies the wants of manufacturers, no considerable quantity of sea-island will fetch this price in the market, and consequently its production has fallen off. So as regards the American rice, which once was in great demand. It is now so undersold by Indian rice that it is not exported, and scarcely holds its own in America by the aid of a heavy protective duty. I did not see the sugar lands of Louisiana. I understand that the sugar culture a good deal fell off, but has recovered itself, aided as it is by a protective duty. It is, however, at a great disadvantage compared to the West India sugar, the frosts often prematurely killing the American annual, while the West Indians get two or three crops from one planting. I doubt if sugar will ever be a great American staple.

We may take, then, the ordinary cotton as the great subject of black labour in the South. For some years the produce has begun to overtop the best years before the war, and the late cotton-picking season, which was going on when I visited the Southern States, very far exceeded any previous crop, the season having been altogether favourable and the late autumn unusually favourable to cotton picking. There seemed to be no doubt that the crop would considerably exceed five millions of bales, and if it had not been for

the extreme stagnation of the cotton manufacturing trade and consequent lowness of prices, the South would be in a fair way to recovery. Let us see, then, how this great cotton crop is raised. There has been an idea prevalent that much of it is due to white labour, and there is some truth in this, but only to a limited degree. It has now been discovered that cotton (really a very hardy plant) will grow very well on the high red soils not generally supposed to be cotton-lands, and by the aid of stimulating fertilisers it is brought to maturity earlier than formerly; consequently it has advanced some distance north of its former limits and a considerable distance up into the higher parts of the Southern States (along the Alleghany range) where small white farmers abound. There has also been a great increase in Texas, where I believe most of the farmers are white, but I did not see that country. In the Carolinas and Georgia it is certainly the case that a good deal of cotton is raised by small upland white farmers who did not raise it before; in part by their own labour and in part by the aid of the black labourers whom they employ. The portion, however, of the crop which is raised exclusively by white labour is, I believe, very small; the whites generally prefer other crops, cotton culture is especially suited to the blacks. There is rather a change from large farmers to small, than from black to white labourers. Taking, then, the normal condition of the cotton districts—white ownership and black labour—the owners still cultivate by hired labour moderate home-farms, but the greater portion of their lands they let out to blacks on a variety of terms. First, there is a mere co-operative arrangement under which the owner supplies land, seed, mule, implements and all, and exercises a general supervision over the culture, giving the labourer a share of the crop rather than taking a share from him. The labourer's share is, moreover, subject to deduction for food supplied to him during the cultivating season. Then we have regular Metayer tenants, who themselves find the mule and implements, the crop being divided with the landlord; and again many tenants who pay a fixed rent in cotton—so many bales—and a few (comparatively rare) who pay money rents. Sometimes white men rent land and cultivate with Negro labourers, but most frequently the owner deals direct with the Negro.

I have said that the cotton cultivation is suited to the blacks; it is easily carried on upon a small scale—as slaves they have learned to raise it. A single mule and a light plough suffice for the operations of a small farm. The cotton gives employment almost all the year round, especially at the season unfavourable to white labour. After preparing the ground, sowing, and tending it, there is much and constant hoeing and clearing to be done. Then at picking-time the Negro family turns out, and much work is done without expense which would be very expensive to do by hired labour. And after

the cotton is picked, many hands, especially the women, find employment in the ginning mills. The ginning system makes the division of shares much easier than it otherwise would be. The hand-gins have completely gone out. All the cotton must of necessity be brought to the mills. After being ginned it is divided, and the account is struck.

The cotton is then produced, and things go on much better than might have been expected under the circumstances. Yet, after all, this is rather attained by make-shifts the result of necessity, than based on a settled and satisfactory system. Although after the war the proprietors and the ex-slaves came to terms to carry on the cultivation, it must not be supposed that the former slaves have generally remained with their old masters. In some cases no doubt this is so, but it is the exception. Not only have war and revolution caused considerable migrations, but there seems to have been a general feeling that freedom was not practically realised till the slaves had left their masters, if it were only for a time. Both parties seem to have felt that it should be so; and it often happened that while remaining on quite friendly terms with their old masters, and even coming to them for advice and assistance, A's former slaves would prefer to cultivate under B, and B's slaves under A. Altogether, somewhat migratory habits were set up which the existing system of agriculture has not tended to diminish. Some men whose means admit of a liberal system, by which assistance is rendered to the cultivators are well satisfied on the whole with the result of the present method, but more generally it is found that there is a want of fixity and stability about it. The cultivation is carried on in a somewhat imperfect and hand-to-mouth sort of way, and the Negroes frequently change about from one estate to another. Except some short clearance leases, there is no system of leases of cleared land; it is merely held from year to year, and there is no system of compensation for improvements under which the tenant might improve his house, his fences, and his land, and settle himself down. On the contrary, it is a common complaint that much land is allowed to run out into ravines, or is otherwise neglected and exhausted, and then abandoned by the tenant.

No doubt the purely commercial system of land-letting succeeds in Scotland and parts of England, where we have capitalist landlords and large capitalist farmers; but I am more and more convinced by all I can see and learn in various countries that a small-farm system, under which the landlord does *not* do all the improvements, never works well without some sort of fixity of tenure. In America there is no system of tenant-right, but land is cheap, and throughout the United States (with perhaps an exception in California, on which I need not here dwell) the agricultural success of the country is due to

small farmers owning their own land. I have then sought with very special interest to ascertain whether the black small farmers of the Southern States have to any considerable extent purchased their farms, or are in the way of doing so.

I freely admit it may well be that if, in the first instance, there had been confiscation of the lands of the whites and every enfranchised black had been given, what they are said to have expected, twenty-five acres and a mule, and left to make the most of it without white assistance or guidance, the result might perhaps have been disastrous. The people might possibly have relapsed into semi-barbarism and squatted down, content to raise a low subsistence from the land. That might or might not have been so. But there certainly is not the least fear that anything of the kind could now result from the acquisition of land by the Negroes by any fair methods. They have become accustomed to independent labour and to raising valuable staples for the market. So far from neglecting these latter in order to raise a low and lazy diet, the common accusation against them now is that they cultivate the staples which bring money, too much to the exclusion of food-supply. I have heard much said of the folly of Negro farmers in buying Western corn and bacon instead of raising these things. This is partly the consequence of the system of cotton-rents which makes a large cotton cultivation obligatory; but also, I dare say, these people know by experience what pays them best. At any rate it is clear that they are not now inclined to lapse into a low style of living; their fault and difficulty is just in the opposite direction. Unfortunately they live too freely and generously, and do not save money to buy land and make themselves independent, as they might.

This is the general rule, I fear, but not the universal practice. Throughout the Southern States there are already a good many Negroes (though very few compared to the whole number) who cultivate land of their own, and there are very many more who own houses and small patches, especially in the vicinity of towns, where they congregated too much at first and where for a time they obtained wages which enabled them to set up house. It is generally said that most of the Negroes who were superior servants on the plantations, and above the ordinary level in the days of slavery, have now acquired land. Though the old proprietors sometimes cling to their land when their means do not justify their holding it, and in some places there is a feeling against letting the land pass into the hands of blacks, there is so much land for sale that those who save money need have no difficulty in buying it.

The statistics which most of the States are now beginning to attempt are very imperfect and unreliable, and it is difficult to ascertain how much agricultural land is now owned by blacks whc



have acquired it since emancipation, and to what extent they are now acquiring land. Even when there are any sort of figures they include all the property of coloured people, and the totals are swelled by the property of those free before the war; for instance, of the French Mulatto Creoles, who are, I believe, found to some extent in Charleston and Savannah, as well as in New Orleans. But from personal experience and inquiries I ascertained that farms owned by emancipated blacks are certainly found here and there scattered about the country. The ice has been broken, the example set.

Georgia, which was not long under a black legislature, but which early adopted liberal principles of white rule, has been held out, in a paragraph which went the round of the papers, as in advance of other States in respect of Negro property; but on examining the latest official papers, I think they somewhat detract from the grounds of this reputation. Most of the property attributed to coloured people consists of household furniture, animals, agricultural tools, &c. They have something more than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million dollars worth of land out of about 86 millions worth in the State. But some of the largest quantities are in counties where there are fewest Negroes, and can hardly be ordinary small farms. I fear, too, from all I can learn that, in these days of cheap cotton, the Negro-owned lands are not now much increasing. Georgia has done nothing special to facilitate the acquisition of land by the Negroes, and what I could gather from personal inquiries rather led me to think that in this respect they were less forward there than in the Carolinas.

In South Carolina more has been done for them and I think they have done more for themselves than in most States. During Carpet-bag rule the States Government established a commission to buy estates as they came into the market and settle freedmen upon them on fair terms of payment, on exactly the plan recommended by the last Parliamentary Committee on the Irish land; and the plan promised success if it had not been interrupted by accusations of fraud and embezzlement against those charged with the management, and the fall of the Carpet-bag Government. A more important and permanent experiment was made on the lands sold by the United States Government for taxes on the Coast of South Carolina. These lands were not given to the Negroes, but were cut up into ten and twenty acre lots, and offered to them for purchase on reasonable terms. They were taken up by blacks, who by paying for them showed both their ability to help themselves and their appreciation of the opportunity offered to them. I visited these tracts, and was very greatly interested in the independent and self-supporting rural communities which I there found. They were under considerable disadvantages. To begin with, most of

them were those low-country Negroes who have been less than the others civilised by contact with the white man. Then the lands on which they are settled are those which have been more and more falling into decadence owing to the decline in long cotton and rice; so much so that the white proprietors of large portions of such lands have suffered them to go out of cultivation, or sold them for a song. No other money-fetching staple has yet been found for these lands, and they are not suitable for short cotton. Hence the Negroes have carried on the long cotton culture at a very great disadvantage. On the other hand they had this considerable advantage that the able-bodied men can do much to make the two ends meet by occasional labour at the ports, and especially on the great phosphate beds which have become a large source of industry and wealth to that part of the country. The fact that the men readily avail themselves of the opportunity of hard and remunerative work and make most admirable labourers at it—as good, I am told, as any in the world—is of itself a practical answer to any suggestion that they are unwilling to work. I have heard it suggested that Negroes are somewhat unreliable workmen for a continuance, and apt to throw up and go off when they have made a little money and want to attend a religious camp-meeting or something of that kind; but there is no question that for a certain time no workman can be more steady and effective. At seasons when no very hard field-work is necessary, these men leave the women and children to hoe and look after the crops, while they earn wages by diving for and cleaning the phosphates. It has probably been an advantage to them that their land has not been such as to enable them to live without hard work, men and women too.

They have had, too, the advantage of aid from friendly Northern and other whites, who do for them those things which they cannot do for themselves. Some very excellent Northern dealers gin and buy their cotton, and white storekeepers have introduced among them a wholesome system of ready-money payment. They owe very much to the devoted Northern and English ladies who have come among them to educate their children. It is somewhat difficult to reconcile conflicting statements; while many or most people attribute to the Negro race some very serious social and other faults, those who have the best opportunity of knowing these land-owning Negroes, represent them as possessed of every virtue; not only those ordinarily conceded to the race, but those usually denied—thrift, carefulness, and family affection. They are said to save in order to buy farms for their sons, and to be altogether a growing and progressive community, unremunerative prices notwithstanding. Perhaps some allowance must be made for a kindly enthusiasm; but also I am convinced that these people more

happily and independently placed and educated to that crave for land which of all things leads to thrift, really are much superior to the average of the Negro race. I could myself see that their homes are better, and that they have many horses and light carts and other evidences of comfort and well-doing.

I visited some of these people in company with a coloured congressman to whom they much look, and was struck by the eager interest with which they (especially the women) questioned him about an attack on the title to the lands which has a good deal disturbed them. It has been attempted or threatened to question in the courts the legality of the sales by United States authority, under which the land came into the hands of the blacks. No doubt it seemed at the time that by these forced sales at a cheap rate the lands were sadly sacrificed, and, the owners being in rebellious contumacy, the proceeds, such as they were, came into the United States Treasury. But, in truth, this particular class of land has fallen to so low a value that if the sale had taken place now, it would perhaps have scarcely realised more than it did when sold after the war. If the money in the Treasury were restored to the old owners, justice tempered with mercy would be done without disturbance.

Many proprietors in South Carolina and elsewhere, far from thinking, as some of our colonists seem to think, that the best way to make sure of hired labour is to debar the labouring population from any independent place on the land, have followed a much wiser course, and encourage by all means in their power the settlement of the Negroes on small holdings owned by themselves. They have rightly deemed that this is the best way to fix a permanent population from which they can draw labour when needed. They have therefore laid out parts of their lands in small lots, and offered facilities to Negroes willing to purchase. Once the blacks are settled down in this way, it is not difficult to maintain friendly relations with them. They are still a good deal dependent on the proprietor of the estate for liberty to graze their cattle in the woods, and other little aids. They are a good-natured, easily-managed race, and they are always ready to accept a good spell of work for a time at least. Proprietors so situated get plenty of labour when they want it on the lands they cultivate themselves, and for any improvements and operations that they may undertake.

On the whole, I am very agreeably surprised to find the position of the emancipated blacks so good, and the industrial relations between them and the whites so little strained and difficult. They are, as a rule, good labourers and very tolerable cultivators. A gentleman who has had much experience of them, and who now labours among them in one of the most Negro parts of Virginia, in describing their character, said that one might take about one-third of them to

be really good and progressive; another third to be so far well-inclined and well-doing that with good management and judicious treatment they may be made good; and the remaining third to be bad. But I am inclined to think, from what I saw and learned elsewhere, that this description is more correct of a particular tract in which many of the best and the worst of the race congregated during the war, than of the country generally; and that in reality both the good thrifty men who have shown a capacity for independence, and the bad who prefer idleness and thieving to work, are far less than this saying implies; the great majority being in the second category, who so far do well that under favourable circumstances they will settle down into an excellent peasantry. It seemed to me that the present situation gives very good ground of hope, and I am sanguine of a favourable issue. The position of the cultivators is such that they may well, with a little kindly aid, become independent farmers; and any man inclined to work honestly and well can earn sufficiently good wages.

All that is now wanted to make the Negro a fixed and conservative element in American society, is to give him encouragement to, and facilities for, making himself, by his own exertions, a small landowner; to do, in fact, for him what we have sought to do for the Irish farmer. Land in America is so much cheaper and more abundant that it would be infinitely easier to effect the same object there. I would by no means seek to withdraw the whole population from hired labour; on the contrary, the Negro in many respects is so much at his best in that function, that I should look to a large class of labourers remaining; but I am at the same time confident that it would be a very great benefit and stability to the country if a large number should acquire by thrift an independent position as landowning American citizens.

Supposing things to settle down peaceably, as I hope they may, I go so far as to say that, though nothing is perfect in this world, the American blacks are in a fair way of becoming a comfortable well-to-do population to a degree found in very few countries; a condition which may compare very favourably not only with the Indian ryot, the Russian serf, or the Irish tenant-farmer, but also with the Dorsetshire labourer. I doubt whether, on the whole, a better labouring population, more suited to the climate and country in which they find themselves, is anywhere to be found. The whites certainly cannot do without them; already the great drawback to the Southern States is the want of that great influx of foreign population which causes the North and West to progress in a geometrical ratio; evidently their true policy is to make the most of the excellent population which they have, and they quite see it. The blacks again certainly cannot do without the whites; their own race is not suffi-

ciently advanced to fulfil the functions now in the hands of the whites.

Newly educated classes, among races hitherto kept down, are apt to over-estimate their own acquirements and powers; that is the tendency of the educated Hindoos of Calcutta and Bombay, and the same tendency shows itself among the educated Mulattos and blacks in America. It is scarcely surprising that they should chafe against the social ostracism of all who have dark blood in their veins, and should long for a Utopia in which educated coloured men own no superior; but I think they are entirely wrong in preaching as they now do to their countrymen the advantages of emigration to Liberia—which however they do not themselves practise. Probably there could be no more notable example of the want of practical ability in these men, than their management of the last exodus from Charleston to Liberia. The whole thing was a purely coloured movement, and the management was in coloured hands. It seems to have been terribly mismanaged; and the result was that after much loss and suffering on the voyage, some of the best of the coloured people who had accumulated money enough to set them up most comfortably in farms of their own in America, were drained of everything they possessed for the expenses of the voyage, and landed in a country where they could earn as labourers about half what they could in their native America, the cost of living being also infinitely dearer. My advice would certainly be—to the blacks in America, “Stay at home, and make the best of an excellent situation,”—to the whites, “Do all you can to keep these people, conciliate them and make the most of them.” I am confident that this may and will be done if only political difficulties and unsettlements do not mar the prospect, and in this view I must now look at the political situation.

GEORGE CAMPBELL.

*(To be concluded in the next Number.)*

## THE URGENT NEED FOR AMENDING OUR BANKRUPTCY LEGISLATION.

By no means the least of the incidental difficulties arising from a rapid increase of trade as carried on by the complex aids of modern credit—the swift transit and transference of commodities over enormous distances—and the still swifter diffusion of intelligence—is the development on a large scale of the necessity of dealing with the estates of bankrupts—some honest and unfortunate; many more reckless without being either unfortunate or honest; and a vast residuum who live by carefully calculating the degree of credulity, indolence, and forbearance of which creditors are capable under the existing state of the law and its administration.

The note at the foot<sup>1</sup> of the page shows very plainly that during the great expansion of business in this country which commenced with the railway and free trade development of 1840—5, the attention of the Legislature has been largely occupied with the failure of one system of bankruptcy procedure after another. The ability, patience, industry, learning, and knowledge of mankind and of business bestowed on these investigations is cogent and obvious proof of the inherent intricacy of the subject itself. Indeed, there is hardly a department of public administration in which the really moving forces to be controlled and directed to a given end are so dissimilar and conflicting. The ideal of a sound bankruptcy law is that it

(1) The modern legislation of England and Wales began with the act of 1571 (13 Eliz. c. 7), which ran on till 1706 (4 Anne, c. 17). Various amending acts occurred; but it was not till 1825 (6 Geo. IV. c. 16) that, under Lord Eldon, a consolidating and enlarging act was passed, founded on the elaborate report of the Commons Select Committee of 1817. In 1831 (1 and 2 Wm. IV. c. 56) "officialism" was set up by Lord Brougham by the establishment of the Bankruptcy Court, with its three judges, thirty official assignees, messengers, &c. The years 1839-40 were marked by the inquiries of a Royal Commission, resulting in 1842 in the act 5 and 6 Vic. c. 122, which extended the Court of Bankruptcy to the provinces, by setting up District Bankruptcy Courts, each with its staff of official assignees, &c. In 1847, by 10 and 11 Vic. c. 102, the Court of Review was abolished, and bankruptcy jurisdiction restored to the Courts of Chancery. In 1849 there were committees of both Lords and Commons on the bill which (in 1849) became the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act. In 1853-4 there was another Royal Commission. In 1861 there was an act bringing insolvent debtors under the procedure of bankruptcy, and authorising deeds of arrangement between bankrupts and creditors. In 1864-5 there was a strong Commons Select Committee, who recommended in substance the abolition of officialism and the adoption of the system which finally (after the failure of bills in 1866 and again under Lord Cairns in 1867) was embodied by Lord Hatherley in the act of 1869, at the present time in force. In 1875 Lord Cairns procured a departmental report on the defects disclosed in practice in the act of 1869, and in 1876, 1877, and 1878 amending bills were introduced under his direction, but failed to pass.

shall accomplish swiftly, cheaply, and justly four things, viz. (1) the collection and distribution of the property of the bankrupt among his creditors according to their rights and priorities; (2) the realisation of that property whatever may be its multifarious or scattered character, in the best manner and at the smallest cost; (3) such an examination of the bankrupt himself, his conduct, affairs, and character, as will in the public interest effectually distinguish in the verdict of final discharge between the honest, the unfortunate, the reckless, and the bad; and (4) lastly, that all this shall be done by a practical blending of the functions of the public tribunal, seeking only the ends of justice; and of the action of the private creditor, devoted chiefly to his escape from the loss he has incurred by turning the bankrupt's assets to the best account.

Oddly as it may appear, it is not the less true that the root-difficulty of a good bankruptcy law in this country consists in the unwillingness of the creditors,—that is of those who have actually lost money, frequently to a large amount, by the bankrupt—to follow up with activity and energy the measures necessary to expose misconduct, or even to realise assets in the best way. In all the inquiries and debates which have taken place since 1817, this holding back of the creditors has been pointed out as the initial impediment. "It is the supineness of the creditors," said Lord Hatherley in the debate in the Lords, on June 2, 1876, "interested in the management of the bankrupt's estate which constitutes the vast difficulty. There is the same difficulty in dealing with the winding up of public companies. The shareholders, except upon the occurrence of some very great scandal, will not interest themselves, and hence gross failures of justice. In private cases creditors mostly write off the loss as a bad debt." And his lordship added a remark which is very true, and states a still further reason for non-interference on the side of the creditor. "If," he said, "the claim of the creditor is very large, he does not wish his name to appear at all. In support of his credit in his trade his desire is to conceal his loss as much as possible, and he therefore discourages public procedure."

Here, however, the wishes of the creditor come into direct contact with the interests of the public. For the benefit of the trading community the want of prudence and caution on the part of the creditor, as well as the circumstances of the failure of the bankrupt, should be made equally public; and for the obvious reason that everything which tends to the restraining of credit to improper persons is distinctly in favour of the honest and industrious dealer; and a system of bankruptcy practice the essence of which shall be publicity is essential as the complement of the acts which, with great wisdom and the best results, have abolished all imprisonment for debts not dishonestly contracted. The certainty of full exposure in the event of

the failure of a borrower would restrain and put an end to no small part of the huge and progressive advances which have been the opprobrium of so many of the revelations of late years.

This supineness of creditors is not a thing to be met by barren lamentations and denunciations, but to be dealt with as one of the leading facts of the problem to be solved. After all, it is a difficulty of perfectly obvious origin. The natural history of a bad debt is very well understood and appreciated by most persons who have seen much of commercial life. In nine cases out of ten it begins in foolish good-nature, lack of judgment, or lack of knowledge on the part of the creditor—none of them circumstances which the human mind likes to keep before it any longer than can be helped. Sometimes the mischief arises from too easy reliance on the personal assurances of some old friend or relative, who has strong reasons for becoming a large borrower on bad security. The sting of deception is then added to the remembrance of error, and the whole subject is a plague and a disgust. The money is gone and the leaf of the ledger is crossed out; and the creditor is not in a mood to waste precious time and good money, accompanied, be it remembered, by the exposure of his own folly or misfortune, in the pursuit of vanishing dividends and tardy vengeance. The remedy for the public evils arising from the operation of these not unnatural motives is precisely that combination of the functions of the tribunal and the action of the creditor which we have just referred to as indispensable. The tribunal apart from the creditor will not and cannot collect the assets in the best way. The creditor apart from the tribunal will not investigate the conduct and affairs of the bankrupt with the care and impartiality required by trading morality and public justice.

The history of our bankruptcy legislation is in substance a narrative of the theories propounded and the experiments tried during the last fifty years for accomplishing these two objects.

Down to the act of the fourth year of Queen Anne (1706), the law relating to bankrupts was wholly in the interest of the creditor, and was full of the savage punishments of the seventeenth century, to be inflicted in every case in which illicit appropriation of property was apparent. The act of 1706 for the first time introduced provisions (very imperfect, it is true) for the discharge of the debtor after the surrender and distribution of all his effects. With some amendments this statute remained in force till the passing, under Lord Eldon, of the Consolidating and Enlarging Act of 1825, founded upon the exhaustive inquiry by the Commons Select Committee of 1817-18. The members of that Select Committee well deserve to be held in grateful remembrance for the industry and skill with which they unravelled in great detail the intricacies of, at that time, a new field of legislative and commercial investigation; and it is in a



degree disheartening to read in their report of sixty years ago a recital of evils and defects which, with but small alteration, would apply to the present time.

"The prominent evils," say the Committee, "of which the public have reason to complain are—(1) the want of care to secure the bankrupt's property, his books and papers, *immediately* after his bankruptcy; (2) the facility with which debts are admitted in consequence of the imperfect provision for their investigation; (3) the want of power on the part of the Commissioners of Bankrupts to expunge debts improperly admitted; (4) the defective management of the bankrupt's estate in consequence of the *absence of any sufficient motive* to secure activity on the part of assignees; (5) the insufficient means of investigating the conduct of the bankrupt and *compelling* him to afford assistance to the assignees from the earliest to the latest stage of the proceeding; (6) the ease with which undeserving and even dishonest bankrupts obtain their certificates, and the total absence of all discrimination between culpability and misfortune; (7) the law by which capital punishment is ordered to be inflicted upon fraudulent bankrupts and upon those who do not surrender, is so severe and so repugnant to the common sentiments of mankind that it becomes totally inefficient in its operation, and hence the most flagitious individuals escape with impunity; (8) the difficulty in securing an early and full division of the bankrupt's property among his creditors; (9) the inadequate allowance made to bankrupts upon the amount of dividends paid, by which creditors are deprived of the full co-operation of the bankrupt."

The legislative measure giving effect in great degree to the recommendations of the Committee of 1817-18 did not become law till 1825, when the Bankruptcy Act of that year repealed twenty-one then existing acts, and consolidated and enlarged the law. The act of 1825 (1) permitted for the first time majorities of creditors to bind minorities; (2) it sanctioned the principle of arrangements, but left them to be carried out by complex deeds; (3) it prescribed that assignees should pay a final dividend within eighteen months; and (4) it left in full force the control of the Commissioners of Bankrupts over the realisation and distribution of the estate. In 1831 there came another act, under Lord Brougham, the effect of which was to apply to bankruptcy the extensive machinery of Officialism, which, with various modifications, continued till the passing in 1869 of the statute now in force. The act of 1831 pensioned off the Commissioners of Bankrupts and set up a Court of Review, composed of a chief and three junior judges; and thirty official assignees were appointed to act with creditors' assignees. Power to discharge the debtor was taken from the assignees and given to the court.

In 1842 another extension of the Official system was made by constituting District Bankruptcy Courts, with twelve commissioners,

(1) This very serious evil and abuse is not yet cured. Indeed, the power still exercised by the bankrupt in selecting the accountant to take possession of the books and papers before they can be seen by any creditor is a fertile source of injustice to creditors. There can be no real reform until this exercise of patronage by the bankrupt at the expense of creditors is sternly suppressed.

twelve deputy registrars, and thirty official assignees. In 1847 the Court of Review was abolished and bankruptcy business again placed under the Court of Chancery. In 1849 an act passed directing that certificates of discharge to bankrupts should be of three classes, according to the merits of each case; but the plan failed because in practice the distinction was not well enforced, and so long as a bankrupt got his discharge the quality of his certificate was not considered. In 1861 insolvent debtors were brought under the bankruptcy law and the old Insolvent Debtors' Court abolished; and, in addition to the official assignee and the unpaid creditors' assignee, creditors were authorised to employ a paid manager. At length, in 1869, after much contention, and after the failure of an elaborate bill by Lord Cairns in 1867, Lord Hatherley succeeded in passing the statute which is now in force, and against the defects of which the outcry has of late years become so loud and general.

The leading features of the act were—(1) that it abolished the excessive officialism which had prevailed since 1831, by putting an end to the official assignees, in whose hands had been lodged by compulsory clauses the collection and distribution of the assets; (2) it abolished imprisonment for debt; (3) it placed the administration of the estate in the hands of creditors, by requiring them to appoint an unpaid committee of inspection from among themselves, and also a paid trustee to carry out the directions of the committee; (4) it provided three modes of settlement, viz. bankruptcy, liquidation by arrangement, and composition. In bankruptcy the court adjudicates the debtor bankrupt on the petition of a creditor and holds a meeting of the creditors and examines the bankrupt in open court. In liquidation and composition the debtor takes the initiative by calling a meeting of his creditors, who determine whether his estate shall be wound up under bankruptcy or by liquidation or composition; but whichever mode may be adopted, there is a committee of inspection and a paid trustee. In bankruptcy, returns and accounts have to be rendered to the court; while under liquidation and composition the interference of the court is almost wholly got rid of.

We have now before us the trial and failure of at least three plausible schemes and theories of bankrupt law. First, there was the mixed system of creditors' control and legal interference, in the form of the Commissioners of Bankrupts, which prevailed to 1831, combined with an oppressive power of imprisoning the debtor. Second, there was the Officialism of the Court of Review, the District Courts, the official assignees, messengers, ushers, brokers, &c., placed by the law in compulsory charge of the estate, to the practical exclusion of the creditors. And lastly, there is the Paid Trustee system set up in 1869, on the abolition of officialism and in pursuance of the theory that, as the realisation of the property in the best manner was for

the direct benefit of the creditors, they would vigilantly superintend the process.

The failure of the Officialism of 1831—69 was utter and disastrous. The wonder is that it endured so long, and the wonder is still greater that it should at any time have been thought possible that the realisation of bankrupt estates could ever be accomplished with economy and satisfaction by an order of exalted government officials, to whose convenience, temper, and caprice the whole body of creditors were held in bondage. Of course there were abuses and neglects of duty; and still more of course there were large defalcations in accounts, the details of which will be found in the report of the departmental committee appointed by Lord Westbury in May, 1864. Compulsory Officialism has been condemned by conclusive experiment as costly, dilatory, wasteful, and corrupt.

Of the failure of the Paid Trustee system set up in 1869 we will now speak; but with a few important words of preface to the effect that at least four positive results have been established as landmarks in bankruptcy legislation by the experience of the last sixty years, and these are—(1) the wisdom and success of the abolition of all imprisonment for debt where fraud is absent; (2) the wisdom and success of including traders and non-traders in the bankruptcy law; (3) the wisdom and success of promoting on principle arrangements and compositions between debtors and creditors; and (4) the wisdom and success of regarding the final discharge of the debtor, under fitting conditions, as one of the most important ends of this class of legislation.

## II.

The speech of Lord Cairns in the Upper House on June 2nd, 1876, in introducing the Bankruptcy Amendment Bill of that year, is the highest, and in substance almost the best authority, to be referred to regarding the defects of the present law. Lord Cairns said—

“The act of 1869, to a greater extent than had ever before been contemplated, handed over to creditors the management of bankrupt estates. But this change has produced evils which are now loudly complained of. These complaints were laid before me last year (1875), and I determined to appoint a small committee of those who were best qualified to judge of the matter. The members of that committee were Mr. Rupert Kettle, a county court judge at Wolverhampton, who has great practical knowledge of the working of bankruptcy proceedings, especially in the country; Mr. James R. Brougham, an experienced registrar of the London Court of Bankruptcy; Mr. Mansfield Parkyns, the comptroller, who makes an annual return of the expenses of bankruptcy; Mr. Henry Nicol, an officer of the Treasury, to whose care the details of the finances of the county courts are entrusted; and, lastly, Mr. Hackwood, who, perhaps, more than any other acting solicitor, has experience of the working of the bankruptcy system. That committee have made a report now before the public, and not the less valuable because of its conciseness.”

Fortified by this latest body of evidence collected by trained experts, and speaking from his own professional experience, Lord Cairns was able to use very precise and plain language in describing the evils to be cured.

"The principle," he said, "of the act of 1869 is, that the creditors shall choose as their trustee a person in whom they have confidence, and that the trustee shall take the responsibility of realising the property of the bankrupt and dividing it among the creditors. In theory nothing can be more plausible, but in practice nothing more futile. It is found in actual fact that it is impossible to get the creditors to work together, and the power falls to one or two persons. The committee say, 'It happens not occasionally, but so frequently as almost to form the rule, that a stranger, so far as appears on the face of the proceedings, is enabled by the proxies he has obtained to vote himself trustee, to fix his own remuneration, to nominate the committee of inspection, to order the payment of his own costs, and finally to vote in liquidation cases the debtor's discharge. We report both upon our own experience, and upon the information we have collected, that nearly all the evils which have led to so much dissatisfaction with the working of the act of 1869 can be traced to the direct or indirect effects of the Proxy system; and that in our opinion no effectual check can be given to these evils so long as remunerative employment is the prize for which proxies can be used.' . . . ."

"In cases of Liquidation or Composition the trustee is absolutely master of the situation. He decides what debts shall be proved, and in all respects what shall be done in the liquidation of the estate. Here is an extract of a letter addressed to me in January (1876) by the Mercantile Law Amendment Society: 'As a rule, creditors rarely attend the meetings convened by the bankrupt at any time within a month of his petition, and at any time or place he pleases. The result is that the debtor, by the aid of the proxies of family, friendly, fully-secured, fictitious, and frequently bribed creditors, can get released from his debts upon almost any terms he thinks fit. The official returns of the comptroller show that there has been a regular and continuous decrease in the dividend per pound of the compositions allowed to creditors in each year since 1869.' This, my lords, is a very serious statement, coming from the quarter it does."<sup>1</sup>

It is, however, fully sustained by the Committee of 1875, who say, "It is the common practice for proxies to be held by persons who at the meeting affirm they represent the views of independent creditors, *but who in reality are paid and retained by the debtor or the candidate for the trusteeship.* Whenever there are assets out of

(1) In support of the statement given above, the following actual case may be cited:—The *Times* of 13th Nov., 1878, contained details of the "liquidation by arrangement" of the old West India firm, recently known as Cottam, Morten, and Co., 4, Lombard Court, City. The firm failed in August, 1878, with liabilities for £194,000, and with assets which, in effect, and after deducting doubtful entries, were under £7,000. The first meeting of creditors was held on 12th Sept. last. At that meeting the statement of accounts was for the first time produced, and by the aid of proxies, chiefly from relations and private friends, and in spite of the opposition of *bonâ-fide* creditors, to whom no notice was given of the intention of the bankrupts to apply there and then for their discharge, the discharge was effectually voted; and the debtors were set free without the prospect of any dividend arising; and without the production of any accounts under conditions which permitted *bonâ-fide* creditors to examine them. The assets will probably suffice to pay the costs of the liquidator, who was, of course, in effect selected by the debtors themselves.

which heavy costs may be paid there is much canvassing and tout-ing for proxies. Proxies are often bought and sold when required to turn the scale in favour of some resolution."

At the annual meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce held at Sheffield in August, 1878, Mr. Martin, the delegate from Plymouth, declared, amidst loud applause, "that the Bankruptcy Act of 1869 was a disgrace to the country. . . . Its plan of liquidation served only to give debtors an opportunity of swindling their creditors. It was nothing less than a legal means of robbery." And reams of testimony could, if needful, be cited to the same effect, but every purpose will be served by inserting the following Memorial to the Prime Minister, presented in January, 1879, by fifty of the most eminent of the bankers and merchants in the City of London.

The memorial sets forth—

"That your Memorialists are, and have been for many years largely engaged in Banking and Commerce, and by reason of the extent and character of their transactions, have had ample means of observing the effect of the Bankruptcy Act of 1869, both as regards Creditors and Debtors; and your Memorialists have to represent to your Lordship and the Government of which you are the head, that the experience of every year adds largely to the body of disastrous facts, which show that the speedy amendment of the Act of 1869 has become one of the most urgent necessities of the time; both in the interest of the mercantile class, and for the maintenance of that high tone of commercial morals and honour for which this country has been distinguished.

"The defects of the present Bankruptcy Law may be shortly stated as follows:—

*First*:—It affords now and vicious facilities to insolvent persons to escape from the reasonable control and supervision of their Creditors, by private arrangements, wholly beyond the jurisdiction of any Public Court or Judge. And by reason of these facilities, it is the fact that every year there is an increasing number of cases in which the grievous and dangerous scandal is exhibited of men failing for vast liabilities, and finding it easy, in consequence of the defects of the present law, to get their speedy discharge by the payment of no dividend, or a dividend of some small fraction of a pound, or even shilling; and without being subjected to any efficient investigation of their affairs, or of the conduct and proceedings which have led to their Insolvency.

*Second*:—That the present law is rendered practically nugatory, by leaving to those who have already incurred losses, the investigation of the Bankrupt's affairs; and has laid upon them the obligation of exposing the misconduct of Bankrupts, which, in the plain interests of public morality and commercial policy, should be dealt with not as a private matter, but by a Public Court and Judge. Experience has amply proved that reliance on Creditors to perform these onerous and costly functions is entirely futile. The Bankruptcy Act of 1861 did contain, in clause 159, provisions for the interference and action of the Court in all cases of misconduct on the part of the Bankrupt, with a view to his exposure and punishment; but in consequence of the failure of legislation to provide an efficient Court and Judge, these most salutary provisions were never enforced.

*Third*:—That owing to the rapid growth and increasing complexities of modern business, as carried on by private partnerships and Joint Stock Companies, limited and unlimited, English and Foreign, it has become perfectly clear that until there is established a Court of Bankruptcy under the presidency of a Judge, distinguished as a Mercantile Lawyer, and free to give his whole time and attention to the administration of his Court, it is impossible that Insolvent Debtors can be adequately dealt with by means of public judicial process, and the estates appertaining to them expeditiously and economically distributed. The same remark is applicable to the Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies; a branch of insolvent business of increasing extent, and unfortunately of increasing notoriety for scandals, and failures of justice. Your Memorialists desire to represent that, in their opinion, great public advantage would arise by the assignment to the efficient Court and Judge—which they respectfully but earnestly recommend—not only of the insolvency business arising from the failure of private persons and firms, but also arising from the failure of Joint Stock Companies, as well as from the estates of deceased Insolvent Debtors."

The memorial was signed by a list of the very first houses in the City, that would fill a closely printed page of this Review.

The Comptroller in Bankruptcy (Mr. Mansfield Parkyns) reports annually to the Lord Chancellor, for presentation to Parliament, on the business of each calendar year. Of the three processes of arrangement between a bankrupt and his creditors established in 1869, the official records give *details* only of the "bankruptcies," that is windings-up commenced on the adverse petition of creditors, and carried through under the supervision of the court. "Liquidations" are windings-up on the petition of the debtor, with the concurrence of the creditors, and of the details of them nothing is known officially, for the accounts of the trustee are not subject to any audit of the court. Of "compositions," in like manner, nothing is known except the number and amount of the compositions.

During the eight years 1870—7 there were—

Bankruptcies	.	.	.	.	.	8,275
Liquidations	.	.	.	.	31,651	
Compositions	.	.	.	.	20,270	
					51,921	
						60,196

that is to say, the liquidations were one-half of the whole, the compositions one-third, and the bankruptcies less than one-sixth; showing very plainly that there resides somewhere a strong motive power in favour of liquidation. And this becomes the more plain when we find, from 1870 to 1877, the liquidations steadily rising from 2,035 to 5,239 per annum, or nearly threefold; the compositions from 1,616 to 3,327 per annum, or more than double; and the bankruptcies falling from 1,351 to 967 per annum, or less by one-third.

The number of bankruptcies set on foot by *creditors* has remained

steadily at about 800 per annum. The decline from 1,351 in 1870 to 967 in 1877 has arisen from the significant preference of *debtors* for liquidation or composition. The following table and note<sup>1</sup> give details:—

I.—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869: ENGLAND AND WALES. NUMBER OF CASES CARRIED THROUGH BANKRUPTCY, AS PER ANNUAL REPORTS.

Year.	Bankruptcies.	Year.	Bankruptcies.	Year.	Bankruptcies.
	No.		No.		No.
1870	1,351	1873	915	1876	976
1871	1,238	1874	930	1877	967
1872	933	1875	965		
Totals .	3,522		2,810		1,943
Average	1,174		927		948

As regards liquidations and compositions we condense the following facts from the Comptroller's report of 1877:—

"In 1868, under the Bankruptcy Act of 1861, there were 8,045 liquidations and compositions, and 9,195 bankruptcies. Then came the Amending Act of 1868, directed to cure some of the abuses of liquidation by trust deeds, and the result was shown in the following year, 1869, when the trusts fell to nearly one-half (4,668 instead of 8,045), and the number of bankruptcies rose 12 per cent. (from 9,195 to 10,396), showing that even the partial amendment of 1868 drove into the more searching process of bankruptcy 3,377 debtors who before the change would have pleasantly slipped through liquidation. After the Act of 1869, there was in 1870 a still further decline of the trusts to 3,651 (from 4,668), indicating that 1,017 debtors did like to face the new and what was supposed to be the sharper process. But the able and skilful solicitors and accountants soon discovered that the Paid Trustee, set up by carefully manipulated proxies and who practically is required to render only such accounts as he thinks fit, could most successfully stifle or defy the creditors' committee, and accordingly the 3,651 trusts of 1870 has rapidly risen to the 8,566 (composed of 3,327 compositions and 5,239 liquidations) of seven years later (1877). These facts do indicate, however, that by rendering the law more stringent an immediate effect is produced in largely diminishing the crowd of doubtful cases."

The following table (II) gives the "liquidations" for the eight years 1870—77, together with the total and average liabilities:—

(1) In 1876 the Comptroller gave the details of 554 cases carried through "Bankruptcy," in 82 of which, with £107,000 of liabilities, there were no assets; in 192 other cases, with £340,000 of liabilities, *all* the assets were absorbed in expenses; and in 278 other cases, with £880,000 of liabilities, there was some dividend, but the expenses were 24 per cent. of the assets. Similar details for 759 cases in 1877, with the general result for the two years, show that in about *one-half* of the bankruptcy cases there are either no assets at all, or the whole of what assets there were disappeared in expenses. Figures are given for 1877, which show the almost ludicrous tendency of bankrupt debtors to magnify their assets in the statements they file. Thus assets put down by debtors at three millions were estimated by their trustees at only half a million.

II.—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869: ENGLAND AND WALES. ABSTRACT OF COMPTROLLER'S ANNUAL RETURNS—"LIQUIDATIONS BY ARRANGEMENT" BETWEEN DEBTORS AND THEIR CREDITORS.

Year.	Cases.	Liabilities.		Year.	Cases.	Liabilities.	
		Total.	Average.			Total.	Average.
	No.	Million £	£		No.	Million £	£
1870	2,035	6·23	3,000	1874	1,440	11·13	2,500
1871	2,872	6·55	2,260	1875	4,233	12·48	3,000
1872	3,691	8·42	2,270	1876	4,986	11·18	2,240
1873	4,152	11·02	2,650	1877	5,239	11·59	2,200
Four years' totals	12,752	32·22		Four years' totals	18,898	16·38	
Four years' average	3,190	8·05	2,545	Four years' average	4,724	10·60	2,485

The points of this table are three: (1) the steady rise in the number of liquidations from 2,035 to 5,239 per annum; (2) the equally steady rise of the total liabilities got rid of by the debtors on easy terms from 6½ to 11½ millions per annum; (3) the equally steady fall of the *average* liabilities from £3,000 to £2,200 indicating a systematic extension of the "free-and-easy" way of escape to lower branches of trade.

In a table<sup>1</sup> (III.) at foot we are able to compile from the official

1) III.—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869: ENGLAND AND WALES. ABSTRACT OF COMPTROLLER'S ANNUAL RETURNS AS REGARDS "COMPOSITIONS" OF DEBTORS WITH THEIR CREDITORS.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Year.	Total.		Not exceeding 1s. in £.		Not exceeding 2s. 6d. in £.		Not exceeding 5s. in £.		Total Cases not exceeding 5s.
	Cases.	Liabilities.	Cases.	Proportion.	Cases.	Proportion.	Cases.	Proportion.	
	No.	Million £.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.	Per cent.	No.
1870	1,616	3·29	76	4·7	206	12·8	400	30·3	772
1871	2,170	3·63	186	8·6	401	21·4	703	32·4	1,393
1872	2,208	3·21	269	13·8	540	24·5	617	29·3	1,456
	5,994	10·13	531	9·0	1,150	19·0	1,840	30·0	3,621
1873	2,422	4·12	126	17·6	562	23·2	702	29·0	1,690
1874	2,519	5·21	501	19·7	558	21·9	744	29·2	1,803
1875	2,691	6·06	541	20·1	610	23·8	790	29·4	1,971
	7,662	15·39	1,468	20·0	1,760	23·0	2,236	29·0	5,461
1876	3,287	5·85	739	22·5	839	25·5	880	26·8	2,458
1877	3,327	4·96	610	18·4	889	26·7	931	28·0	2,430
	6,614	10·81	1,349	20·0	1,728	26·0	1,811	27·0	4,888
Total, 8 years	20,270	36·30	3,348	16·0	4,638	23·0	5,887	30·0	13,973
Average, 8 yrs.	2,533	4·56	420	—	580	—	738	—	1,760
Averages:—									
1870—2	2,000	3·40	180	9·0	383	19·0	613	30·0	1,207
1873—5	2,554	5·13	489	20·0	587	23·0	744	20·0	1,821
1876—7	3,305	5·06	675	20·0	864	26·0	904	27·0	2,444



reports more extended details relating to "compositions." The chief results of the table are four: (1) the rise in the "compositions" from 1,616 to 3,327 per annum; (2) the rise in the total liabilities from 3½ to 5 millions per annum; (3) the startling increase in the number of cases in which the dividends do not exceed one shilling in the £ from 5 per cent. of the whole mass of cases in 1870 to 20 per cent. seven years later, and the similar increase from 13 to 27 per cent. of the cases in which not more than half-a-crown in the £ is paid, and (4) the rise of the total cases in which not more than five shillings in the £ is paid from 772 to 2,430, or more than three-fold.

Not only are the complaints loud and deep of the effect of the Act of 1869 in permitting the easy escape of scheming and roguish debtors, but they are fully as emphatic regarding the excessive and growing costliness of liquidation and composition, and (as we have seen in Table III.) the rapid descent of dividends to a point where they vanish altogether. Upon this subject we compile from the Report of 1875 to the Lord Chancellor and from the annual returns of the Comptroller the following evidence:—

"The committee find that the complaints of the expence of the present system are well founded. The opportunity of running up large expenses has led to most reprehensible practices in the conduct of estates. One of the greatest of the abuses is the accumulating uncontrolled in the hands of trustees of large sums of money arising from realised property and undivided dividends. These funds are at present used by the trustees as they please; and, although belonging to a variety of separate estates, are mostly mixed together in the trustee's private account. These monies should be paid into the Bank of England, and would certainly maintain there an average balance of two or three million<sup>1</sup> sterling at present unprofitable, 'except so much of it as may be, and no doubt is, employed for their own use by trustees in liquidation and sometimes in bankruptcy.'" The Comptroller says, "The use of this fund would, as under former acts, indemnify the public for the cost of the courts (a cost now provided by Parliament) and the heavy expense of prosecutions under the Debtors Act, 1869, and might relieve creditors from some direct charges; but, of much greater importance to them, the funds realised, amounting to nearly four millions per annum, would be placed in security, and a strong temptation to trustees to speculate with them and to delay dividends would be removed."

It will scarcely be denied that the evidence now collected regarding the working and effects in practice of the Act of 1869 justifies fully at least the four following conclusions, viz. :—

1. That while right and sound in the principle of abolishing the excessive officialism of 1831—69, and restoring to the creditors the opportunity of full control in the realisation of the bankrupt's estate, and full power to deal with the bankrupt himself, either by bankruptcy or by liquidation or composition without bankruptcy, the

(1) Very competent judges say that the balance would be nearer five than three millions. But whether three or five millions, it is quite certain that the profit to be derived by the Treasury from the surplus balances will be far greater than the total expense of the most perfectly reformed system and the most efficient court and judge.

Act is pervaded by the fatal defect of supposing that the vigilance and zeal of the creditors, for their own and the public interest, will be sufficient to ensure the best realisation and earliest distribution of the assets; as well as the most fitting treatment of the bankrupt himself, on grounds of commercial morals and public justice. Most ample and varied experience has proved beyond all cavil that the reluctant, scattered, and conflicting interests of creditors are not to be relied on for a moment as against the strong personal motives and concentrated energies of the debtor, his confederates, and friends to take advantage of every loophole and technicality of the law to escape from a crushing burden of liabilities, whether honestly or recklessly incurred.

2. That the plan of a paid trustee to collect and administer the estate is in itself sound, but unless subjected to a more vigilant, central, and judicial control than any committee of creditors can or will exercise, it is source of the most reprehensible abuses and delays, and the cause of excessive and growing expense.

3. That the exceedingly lucrative nature of the office of paid trustee has, speaking generally, rapidly created a large body of persons—accountants, solicitors, and others—who seek to extend their occupations and their gains by establishing a reputation among debtors for the astuteness, audacity, and stubbornness with which they protect from disagreeable consequences even the most questionable insolvents who become their clients; and the large success which has attended the operations of these persons is among the strongest reasons for amending a law under which it is possible for so demoralising a system to flourish.

4. That without in any degree going back to the exploded officialism of 1831—69, the remedy required is so to strengthen the control of the Bankruptcy Court as to enable it to perform those functions of vigilance in the public interest which the creditors cannot and will not perform themselves.

### III.

The nature of the amendments which have been embraced in the three bills framed under the guidance of the present Chancellor, Lord Cairns, and introduced in the sessions of 1876, 1877, and 1878, but only to linger on from month to month on the notice paper and then ignominiously disappear, were indicated as follows in the Chancellor's speech of 2nd June, 1876.

“Now, my lords, as to our remedies. I will set out by saying that we desire to preserve the principle of the Act of 1869, believing it to be good and wholesome, and that the evils arise from the defective manner in which it is carried out. The first improvement we propose to make in the present system is this:—This system on the one hand affords an inducement to creditors, and especially to creditors who are inflamed by temper, to make persons bankrupt

who have been guilty of no misconduct, and whose trading has been perfectly *bonâ fide*. On the other hand, it offers an inducement to debtors who have misconducted themselves and incurred debts without a reasonable prospect of being able to pay them to run a race with their creditors and force them to a composition, which is agreed to, or apparently agreed to, by a majority of the creditors. We propose that in all cases of liquidation, whether the person initiating the proceedings is a creditor or is the debtor, that application should be made to one and the same court for what I may term, in the first instance, liquidation. Security will be taken that the application shall be in the court of a district where the debtor is known, and where his creditors are to be found. There is no such security now.

"We propose that the Court should have power to make a liquidation order, the immediate effect of which would be that the debtor would be called upon to furnish a list of his creditors. Then a provisional committee would be formed to act until the first general meeting of the creditors. We propose that at the general meeting of the creditors a committee of inspection should be appointed for the purpose of investigating the affairs of the debtor, and that the investigation should be held as soon as possible. At the second meeting of creditors it would be for an adequate majority of the creditors to decide whether they would discharge the debtor or make him a bankrupt. Any proposal for a composition must be made with the knowledge of the committee of inspection; and in the adoption of such a proposal not only will a majority of the creditors be requisite, but the rights of the minority will be protected. We propose that the trustee shall be appointed, not by the creditors at large, but by the committee of inspection, and that he shall hold office at the pleasure and under the inspection of that committee at a *maximum* scale of remuneration. The use of proxies will be permitted, but if a trustee should use them for his own interest the court will have a right to deprive him of his trusteeship. With regard to deeds of arrangements, which make over the whole property of the debtor, those will depend on the vote of a majority excluding secured creditors.

"We propose, further, that all accounts in bankruptcy and in liquidation shall be audited, and that in all cases whether the bankruptcy or the liquidation be closed or not, the whole of the property remaining in the hands of the trustees shall at the end of two years be paid into court, so that there may be every inducement to the trustees to close each case, where it is possible, within two years. There are various minor provisions in the bill to which I need not at this moment refer; but I may be allowed to say that the measure proposes to repeal the Act of 1869, so that the bill may be complete in itself, containing the entire law on the subject with which it deals. I have only to add that, if the bill receives your lordships' sanction, I propose to introduce a bill making corresponding alterations in the Debtors Act of 1869."<sup>1</sup>

This is all very sensible and sound, but since 1876 the scandals have gone on becoming more and more outrageous, and public opinion has so ripened that the case can scarcely now be met by what in 1876 might have been sufficient.

The Memorial of the bankers and merchants of the City of London most justly lays great stress on the transference to the Court of Bankruptcy of the windings-up of Joint-Stock Companies, a branch of business now scattered among the Courts of Chancery; and, further,

(1) Several high authorities deprecate these frequent recastings of the bankruptcy laws, on the ground that it disturbs the renderings and meanings which the courts and the bar have established after years of conflict. There is force in this view; and, at least, if the acts are consolidated, especial care should be taken to preserve the established language.

a branch of practice which, as the memorial says, has become "unfortunately of increasing notoriety for scandals and failures of justice."<sup>1</sup> The memorial also calls for the establishment of "an efficient court and of a judge eminent as a mercantile lawyer, and free to give his whole time and attention to the administration of his court. To the same court also should be transferred the business connected with the estates of deceased insolvent debtors."

The functions of this efficient or central or chief judge in bankruptcy would, it is clear, be more administrative than legal. The legal part of the difficulty is, perhaps, the least, for even if all the alterations of the statute law given in outline by Lord Cairns were duly enacted, it would still be necessary to find some eminent person to take charge of their active enforcement. It has been well said that efficient bankruptcy law is efficient bankruptcy administration. The defect of the present court is that the functionary called the chief judge is one of the vice-chancellors, who sits only in bankruptcy when appeals on some nice or new point have to be argued and decided. The Chief Judge desired by the City Memorial is a far different person—that is to say, he is a person upon whom the legislature and the public can, if need be, turn round and visit with censure or dismissal if the administration of the bankruptcy business of the country becomes defective, still less scandalous. He should be a man already of favourable repute for knowledge, quickness, and force of character, in the prime of life, and with the ambition to distinguish himself by doing well a piece of difficult work. There are plenty of such men to be found.

One of the earliest and most important services to be rendered by such a Chief Judge would be to stop altogether the vicious and indecent practice which has grown up of the debtor, on the eve of his bankruptcy, selecting of his own choice the accountant and solicitor to be called in, and put for some indefinite period in full possession of all books and papers, in order, as it is said, to prepare a statement of his affairs: as if any man of common-sense and honesty would publicly proclaim himself a bankrupt without having carefully compiled, in his own office, a statement conclusive enough of his inability to go on. Of course the professional parties selected are greatly obliged to the debtor for his exercise in their favour of a valuable piece of patronage; and their gratitude, as is well understood, is manifested through the whole course of the winding-up. This is an old grievance, as the report of 1817—18 shows—but it is a grievance and

(1) As regards Joint-Stock companies the time has fully come for consolidating and enlarging the existing statutes. In the course of the seventeen years of incessant conflict under the Joint-Stock Acts of 1862—7 we have arrived at a body of joint-stock law of great practical value, but so scattered and piecemeal that it is very difficult of certain application; and no greater service could be rendered to all classes than its skilful and systematic condensation into one statute.

an abuse so serious that, until it is radically cured, there can be no real reform.

The clause (159) in the Act (chiefly prepared by Lord Westbury) of 1861, and referred to in the City Memorial, was intended by its author—no mean authority on bankruptcy practice—to prevent the facilities given to debtors to get rid once for all of the burden of their liabilities, from degenerating into the license into which, in fact, these facilities have become permanently enlarged. Lord Westbury's notion was that in all the cases in which a debtor wrongfully contracted debts or fraudulently dealt with his property, the proper course would be to inflict upon him such an amount of punishment as would be commensurate with his offence, and then left him to go free. Section 159 therefore provided—

“That if on the hearing of an application for an order of discharge, the assignees or any creditor, and if, and without such allegation, the court should be of opinion, that there was ground for charging the bankrupt with acts or conduct amounting to a misdemeanour, it should be competent to the court to direct that the bankrupt should be indicted and prosecuted [the 223rd section relieved the estate from the costs of the prosecution]. If the bankrupt was not accused of acts amounting to misdemeanour, or if he should have been accused and acquitted, but in either case there should be made, or should appear to the court to exist, objection to the granting of an immediate discharge, the court should proceed to consider the conduct of the bankrupt before and after adjudication, and the manner and circumstances in and under which his debts had been contracted; and if it should be of opinion that he had done any of the acts enumerated in the section [which included all the offences for which the Commissioners of the Insolvent Debtors' Court were authorised to remand a debtor to prison, under the 1st & 2nd Vict., chap. 110], *the court might either refuse an order of discharge, or suspend it, or grant it, upon such conditions as to after acquired property as it thought fit, or might sentence the bankrupt to be imprisoned for any period not exceeding one year.*”

It is unhappily true that, chiefly in consequence of the non-provision of an efficient chief judge, this most proper provision was reduced to a dead letter.

In Scotland, where, on the whole, the bankruptcy law seems to answer its purpose—although complaints of laxity are beginning to be heard both in Glasgow and Edinburgh—the success arises in a great degree from the compulsory examination in public before the sheriff of every bankrupt; and from the circumstance that in Scotland there has been long established a body of Chartered Accountants of high professional character and attainments, and distinguished especially by the skill and integrity with which they have for a long period chiefly conducted the bankruptcy business of the country, under the supervision of the courts.

In England, whatever may be the difficulties of effective reform, there can be no peace till these difficulties are overcome. The Comptroller estimates the loss in England and Wales by bad debts at eighteen millions sterling per annum; and the larger part of the

loss is directly traceable to the defects of the present bankruptcy law. Eighteen millions of worse than waste has, in these days of foreign competition, all the evil effect of a heavy export duty on English produce. But the money loss is the least part of the mischief. The facility of getting rid of liabilities, however contracted, is rapidly demoralising all branches of trade, from the highest to the lowest. Men waste their own means, large and small, and waste the means of their relatives, friends, and creditors in starting enterprises of which they have no real knowledge. They carry them on recklessly; they live profusely; they reduce to beggary honest and hard-working competitors in the same line of trade; and for the very sufficient reason that the magnificent insolvent, with a complacent reliance on the easy process of liquidation, to be conducted practically under his own guidance, can and does go on for years so conducting his business that losses have no terror for him. Under such a state of things it is idle to talk of economic laws of supply and demand. Those laws suppose honest trading, and a wholesome horror of the disgrace of bankruptcy. We have had hundreds of examples lately, and on the largest scale, that the vicious weakness and laxity of the bankruptcy laws are rapidly expelling the honesty and putting an end to the sentiment of disgrace. For this end a swift and certain remedy must be found:—and a remedy which ought to be all the more swift and certain because, properly carried out, it will not add one single farthing to the expenses of the public treasury.

POSTSCRIPT.—This article was necessarily written before the Government Bill could be introduced on the 17th February, but it is with natural pleasure that we find the speech and bill of Lord Cairns entirely confirmatory of the views expressed in this article. Indeed, there is scarcely a single fact or argument used by ourselves, which is not confirmed by the official statement of the Lord Chancellor. The bill admits the essential and central reform of a chief judge in bankruptcy. It also provides for effective control over the paid trustee by the audit of his accounts, the payment of assets to separate banking accounts, the limitation of commission, the curtailment of proxies, and the general supervision of the chief judge. The chief judge will also have power to deal with offences on the part of the bankrupt. The bill does not provide for the transference of joint stock company liquidations, or the estates of deceased insolvents from the Court of Chancery to the Court of Bankruptcy, and so far we consider it to be defective. But as a whole the bill is entitled to support. It will be opposed by a numerous body of interested parties, and nothing short of the most resolute perseverance on the part of the Government will carry it through the House of Commons.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE question of the Zulu war having been dealt with in a separate article by another hand, while nothing of material novelty has occurred in the execution of the Berlin Treaty or the Afghan settlement, it may be well in these remarks to examine the position and prospects of the Liberal party at the beginning of the resumed session in their relation to facts, too often and too generally forgotten, but, none the less, of the first order of political importance. While there has been a conspicuous absence of any wish or attempt to make party capital out of the disaster that has befallen our troops in South Africa, signs abound that the revival of spirit and confidence, which was the great feature in the short December sitting, among the various sections of the Liberal party, is a process still actively in operation.

That when the appeal to the constituencies comes it will strain ministerial resources to the utmost to secure a narrow majority; that any trivial accident may convert this majority into a minority; that the result, whatever it be, must be mainly dependent on the tact and effort which the controllers of Liberal policy in the interval display—this is the general conviction of the party. Under these circumstances it is essential that no legitimate aid to success should be overlooked, and that nothing which can actually and decisively shift the balance of parties should be left undone. Here it is at once clear that Irish politics constitute an element, not to be omitted from our calculation. How indispensable the Irish vote really is to Liberals at the present conjuncture, was shown in a striking and suggestive letter published in the *Times* of December 20th, the author of which veiled his identity in the signature, "Observer." In the course of a very searching analysis of the division on Mr. Whitbread's amendment, it was shown that while only six Irish non-Conservative members voted for the Government, thirty-four voted against it. The total of disposable Irish votes in a political division was estimated, exclusive of four vacant seats, at one hundred and one, of which thirty-six were put down as permanently standing to the credit of the Government, and sixty-five as at least available under propitious circumstances for the Opposition. Further, the writer dwelt upon the fact that hitherto the Irish Liberals had acted under the influence of Mr. Butt, whom he rightly described as a Conservative first and a Home Ruler afterwards, and that the depreciation of Mr. Butt's authority was sufficiently shown by the fact that whereas in August he induced the Irish members almost *en masse* to follow him into the Ministerial lobby, in December only six of the Irish non-Conservatives supported the Government, while thirty-four went with the Opposition. Of the balance of the entire total—one hundred and one—forty-one voted for the Government, and thirty-four were absentees, this abstention being, in the opinion of "Observer," due to the influence of Mr. Butt.

Here, then, we have the fact, that, notwithstanding Mr. Butt's nominally retained leadership of the Irish members, it was to the growing disinclination of these gentlemen to support the Government that the diminution of the Ministerial majority last December was mainly due. The political moral to be drawn can scarcely be considered doubtful. As "Observer" put it, "This is not a state of things which is likely to continue." In other words, Mr. Butt's influence must prove unavailing to throw the weight of a party which, equally by its tradition and its composition, is mainly Liberal, into the scale of Conservatism. It is now perfectly clear that this distinguished parliamentary tactician and debater has lost the confidence of many of his former followers. The very circumstance that Home Rule is discredited points to this conclusion. It is discredited doubtless; but why? For the simple reason that the individual politician with whom Home Rule is mainly identified is himself discredited with his party. Mr. Butt has always shown, and may be trusted to continue to show, signal ability of that peculiar kind which is rated so high in the House of Commons. He is a debater of rare power, he is a speaker of consummate readiness, but he is also a consistent and a strong Conservative. There may, perhaps, be some who have forgotten that Mr. Butt's first appearance before the English public was when, at a Protection meeting held in Drury Lane Theatre four-and-thirty years ago, he was introduced as a professor from Dublin, who would deliver an address against Free Trade. Now, quite apart from the Home Rule movement, Ireland is a country the predominant colour of whose politicians is Liberal. From the Whigs and Liberals the Irish are indebted for all which they have got from England. If Catholic Emancipation was a Tory measure, it was yielded under Liberal pressure, and it broke up the party that carried it. We may therefore take it for granted that the Irish will return, are even now returning, to their historic political allegiance. When Mr. Butt passes away the succession may be divided, but amongst the claimants to the vacant leadership none probably will have a better title than Mr. Parnell. In Ireland his popularity is great and his position substantial. He has exhibited at Westminster a rare faculty of self-control. Nothing could have been more remarkable than the discretion which he consistently displayed under circumstances of singular trial and excitement during two sessions of Parliament, when, had he acted with the impetuosity of his race, he would certainly have been committed by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Assuming, therefore, that this view of the union of the Irish Liberals under the leadership of Mr. Parnell is likely to be fulfilled, the question which we have to consider is the possibility of an honourable and advantageous understanding between the Irish and English sections of the Liberal party at Westminster. Granted that Home Rule is as defunct as some people say; the sense of



grievance underlying the demand, and alone rendering it possible, remains. Until the condition of Ireland is more satisfactory than it now is, is more thoroughly assimilated to that of England so far as laws and parliamentary enactments can assimilate it, there will always be a discontent, which may have its expression in an agitation for Home Rule one day, for University Education the next, for Land Reform the third. The mention of these last two subjects suggests the paramount question of the hour in Ireland. It is therefore in the direction of these that, as practical politicians, men should look for the opportunities of such a *rapprochement* as has just been mentioned. Now on one of these matters it is a foregone conclusion that the Liberal party can hardly hold out any prospect of the power or disposition to satisfy the Irish demand. If the Education question is to be dealt with at all in the spirit in which the Irish priesthood apparently insist, the will must be left to the Conservatives. It is true that the recent negotiations between a Conservative Cabinet and the Irish hierarchy have collapsed. For that miscarriage two causes may be suggested: first, the increased stringency of the terms put forward by a clergy stimulated by the symptoms of concession; secondly, the indisposition of the Conservative chiefs to test too severely the loyalty of their more sensitively Protestant followers.

Is, therefore, the position hopeless? We answer with an unhesitating negative. On the ground of Education the possibility of cordially united action between Irish and English Liberals is remote. But after all the educational problem is only one of two that press for a solution, and of these two it is not the more urgent. It may, indeed, be doubted whether it is a popular question at all—whether it would have any existence were it not for the priestly initiative. It is noticeable that during the recent discussions in the Irish press on the subject of the proposed Catholic University, little or nothing has been heard of the minimum with which the Irish people would be satisfied. The one point dwelt upon has been the impossibility for sacerdotal reasons of accepting anything in which the principle of denominational endowment was not embodied in its most drastic and unqualified shape. The cry of the clergy may have been echoed by the students, but the bulk of the population has not given utterance to a syllable. If, however, we look to the second of the two matters suggested in the preceding paragraph, Land Reform, we shall find ourselves in a very different atmosphere, and surrounded by an entirely changed set of considerations. Here we have not merely a political cry but a national grievance, proclaimed with unmistakable volume by the popular voice, the remedy of which may well engage the earnest energies of statesmanship. We are perfectly aware of the practical difficulties which, it will be said, lie in the way of any such legislation as this, when proposed to the Liberal party. Whig territorial interests in England, it will be

declared, must be gravely jeopardized by a measure that is "impregnated with the contagious taint of confiscation." If Whigs are wise these apprehensions will prove illusory. It may even be said that there is no necessity, for the purpose of placing the land system of Ireland upon a satisfactory basis, to introduce any new principle at all. Certainly there is nothing in an attempt, which may be considered at once sufficient and practical, to do this, that can be held to violate or menace the sacred rights of English landlords. The political usefulness of such an attempt as this is self-evident. Any party which offered to secure for Ireland a fair adjustment of the land difficulty would at once gain the enthusiastic adhesion of Irish Liberalism, for the simple reason that it would be greeted with the approving acclaims of the entire Irish people. It may be difficult for some Englishmen to understand this. Although the development of trade and commerce is doing something towards the creation of that middle class in Ireland which is the guarantee of English prosperity and stability, commerce and trade can never engage the energies of more than a small section of the nation. The country is and will remain an agricultural country, and the dominating interest will be that of the small farmers and the peasantry.

Nor is it by any means hopeless to discover the lines on which such a policy as this might proceed. It would, indeed, be idle to hope that the measure could have the characteristic of absolute finality. In the matter of land tenure especially the conditions of a country are perpetually changing, and legislation must be more or less of a periodical necessity. But as regards a temporary solution of the problem, the direction in which we must look is tolerably clear. Mr. Butt's Land Act of last session, which, with its profuse array of full and elaborate clauses, is a storehouse of literature on the subject, may be regarded as containing the maximum which the Irish tenants or peasantry claim. What, then, is the minimum with which it may be reasonably supposed that they would rest content? It will be remembered that Mr. Shaw Lefevre's Committee suggested an amendment to Mr. Butt's sweeping proposals, involving the extension of the principle of Mr. Bright's clauses. The effect of these may be very briefly described. To speak with comprehensive generality, their first tendency would be to assimilate the working of the Irish Land Act to the Irish Church Act. Nothing in the nature of confiscation need be dreaded for one moment. There would not be involved in such an expedient the appropriation of a single sixpence of the surplus funds of the extinct establishment to the benefit of a race of Irish peasant proprietors. The State would do nothing more than it does at present—advance money upon sound security. The only change would be that the Irish people would have guaranteed to them under the Land Act the same knowledge which they have of the opportunities at their disposal as they possess under the Church Act, and that they would also have guaranteed that this

knowledge should not be barren of results. The boon which is now often only a theoretical one would have a real and practical existence. There would thus be created a body intermediary between the commissioners and the people, which body would be empowered to make purchases from the Encumbered Estates Court, and, so to speak, to retail them to the multitude. At the present moment the opportunity which that court offers with one hand it does in effect withdraw with the other. It sells properties, but it will not break them up, and thus it is only a limited class of purchasers who can come into the market.

Admirable and commanding as such a feature as this must be, there is another quality which any measure of land reform to be generally satisfactory in Ireland must possess. It must secure tenants against capricious eviction so long as a reasonable rent is paid. At present the very clauses in the Land Act which secure compensation for unexhausted improvements operate occasionally as levers for facilitating these evictions. What the Irish tenant claims is that, so long as he is able and willing to pay a fair rent, he should not at any moment be liable to be evicted from his home, with a lump sum of money in his hand by way of solatium. This is a point in which there is room for some difference of opinion, and those who hold that absolute authority over individuals is inherent in the fact of territorial proprietorship will consider the Irish tenant an unreasonable and revolutionary person.

If the programme promises, first, the enthusiastic approval of the Irish people; secondly, the unhesitating support of the Irish members; thirdly, the material guarantee of a genuine and durable alliance between English and Irish Liberalism; if, in addition to this, it can be shown that it is only by such an alliance that the Liberal party can hope to assert itself at the forthcoming general election—it would be surely suicidal for Whig timidity to reject this counsel. It may be that the Irish Nationalists, whose cry is Home Rule first and reform afterwards, perceiving that a Land Act such as that of which the outline has here been sketched would remove the most glaring of all Irish grievances, might successfully combine to thwart the policy. It may be that the Irish priesthood would succeed in giving the Education question precedence of all others. But the course which has been here advised has, at least, two obvious recommendations—in the first place it is, as we believe, practicable; in the second place it is logical. It is logical, because already grave measures in reforming the electoral machinery of Ireland—such as the assimilation of the Irish to the English franchise—have been accepted by the Liberal party. The cordial acceptance of the principle of a Land Bill conceived in the spirit now urged, would only be a step further in the direction which the acceptance of these measures of practical reform already marks.

*February 24, 1879.*



THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

---

No. OXLVIII. NEW SERIES.—APRIL 1, 1879.

---

ON THE CHOICE OF BOOKS.<sup>1</sup>

It is the fashion for those who have any connection with letters, in the presence of thoughtful men and women, eager for knowledge, and anxious after all that can be gotten from books, to expatiate on the infinite blessings of literature, and the miraculous achievements of the press: to extol, as a gift above price, the taste for study and the love of reading. Far be it from me to gainsay the inestimable value of good books, or to discourage any man from reading the best; but I often think that we forget that other side to this glorious view of literature:—the misuse of books, the debilitating waste of life in aimless promiscuous vapid reading, or even, it may be, in the poisonous inhalation of mere literary garbage and bad men's worst thoughts.

For what can a book be more than the man who wrote it? The brightest genius, perhaps, never puts the best of his own soul into his printed page; and some of the most famous men have certainly put the worst of theirs. Yet are all men desirable companions, much less teachers, fit to be listened to, able to give us advice, even of those who get reputation and command a hearing? Or, to put out of the question that writing which is positively bad, are we not, amidst the multiplicity of books and of writers, in continual danger of being drawn off by what is stimulating rather than solid, by curiosity after something accidentally notorious, by what has no intelligible thing to recommend it, except that it is new? Now, to stuff our minds with what is simply trivial, simply curious, or that which at best has but a low nutritive power, this is to close our minds to what is solid and enlarging, and spiritually sustaining. Whether our neglect of the great books comes from our not reading at all, or from an incorrigible habit of reading the little books, it ends in just the same thing. And that thing is ignorance of all the greater literature of the world. To neglect all the abiding parts of

(1) A Lecture given at the London Institution.

knowledge for the sake of the evanescent parts is really to know nothing worth knowing. It is in the end the same thing, whether we do not use our minds for serious study at all, or whether we exhaust them by an impotent voracity for idle and desultory "information," as it is called—a thing as fruitful as whistling. Of the two plans I prefer the former. At least, in that case, the mind is healthy and open. It is not gorged and enfeebled by excess in that which cannot nourish, much less enlarge and beautify our nature.

But there is much more than this. Even to those who resolutely avoid the idleness of reading what is trivial, a difficulty is presented, a difficulty every day increasing by virtue even of our abundance of books. What are the subjects, what are the class of books we are to read, in what order, with what connection, to what ultimate use or object? Even those who are resolved to read the better books are embarrassed by a field of choice practically boundless. The longest life, the greatest industry, the most powerful memory, would not suffice to make us profit from a hundredth part of the world of books before us. If the great Newton said that he seemed to have been all his life gathering a few shells on the shore, whilst a boundless ocean of truth still lay beyond and unknown to him, how much more to each of us must the sea of literature be a pathless immensity beyond our powers of vision or of reach—an immensity in which industry itself is useless without judgment, method, discipline; where it is of infinite importance what we can learn and remember, and of utterly no importance what we may have once looked at or heard of. Alas! the most of our reading leaves as little mark even in our own education as the foam that gathers round the keel of a passing boat! For myself, I am inclined to think the most useful part of reading is to know what we should not read, what we can keep out from that small cleared spot in the overgrown jungle of "information," the corner which we can call our ordered patch of fruit-bearing knowledge. Is not the accumulation of fresh books a fresh hindrance to our real knowledge of the old? Does not the multiplicity of volumes become a bar upon our use of any? In literature especially does it hold—that we cannot see the wood for the trees.

A man of power, who has got more from books than most of his contemporaries, has lately said: "Form a habit of reading, do not mind what you read, the reading of better books will come when you have a habit of reading the inferior." I cannot agree with him. I think a habit of reading idly debilitates and corrupts the mind for all wholesome reading; I think the habit of reading wisely is one of the most difficult habits to acquire, needing strong resolution and infinite pains; and I hold the habit of reading for mere reading's sake, instead of for the sake of the stuff we gain from reading, to be

one of the worst and commonest and most unwholesome habits we have. Why do we still suffer the traditional hypocrisy about the dignity of literature, literature I mean, in the gross, which includes about equal parts of what is useful and what is useless? Why are books as books, writers as writers, readers as readers, meritorious and honourable, apart from any good in them, or anything that we can get from them? Why do we pride ourselves on our powers of absorbing print, as our grandfathers did on their gifts in imbibing port, when we know that there is a mode of absorbing print which makes it impossible we can ever learn anything good out of books?

Our stately Milton said in a passage which is one of the watch-words of the English race, "as good almost kill a Man as kill a good Book." But has he not also said that he would "have a vigilant eye how Bookes demecane themselves, as well as men; and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors"? . . . Yes! they do kill the good book who deliver up their few and precious hours of reading to the trivial book; they make it dead for them; they do what lies in them to destroy "the precious life-blood of a master spirit, imbalm'd and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life;" they "spill that season'd life of man preserv'd and stor'd up in Bookes." For in the wilderness of books most men, certainly all busy men, *must* strictly choose. If they saturate their minds with the idler books, the "good book," which Milton calls "an immortality rather than a life," is dead to them: it is a book sealed up and buried.

It is most right that in the great republic of letters there should be a freedom of intercourse and a spirit of equality. Every reader who holds a book in his hand, is free of the inmost minds of men past and present; their lives both within and without the pale of their uttered thoughts are unveiled to him; he needs no introduction to the greatest; he stands on no ceremony with them; he may, if he be so minded, scribble "doggrel" on his Shelley, or he may kick Lord Byron, if he please, into a corner. He hears Burke perorate, and Johnson dogmatise, and Scott tell his border tales, and Wordsworth muse on the hillside, without the leave of any man, or the payment of any toll. In the republic of letters there are no privileged orders or places reserved. Every man who has written a book, even the diligent Mr. Whitaker, is in one sense an author; "a book's a book although there's nothing in't;" and every man who can decipher a penny journal is in one sense a reader. And your "general reader," like the gravedigger in Hamlet, is hail-fellow with all the mighty dead; he pats the skull of the jester; batters the cheek of lord, lady, or courtier; and uses "imperious Caesar" to teach boys the Latin declensions.

But this noble equality of all writers—of all writers and of all readers—has a perilous side to it. It is apt to make us indiscrimi-

nate in the books we read, and somewhat contemptuous of the mighty men of the past. Men who are most observant as to the friends they make, or the conversation they join in, are carelessness itself as to the books to whom they entrust themselves, and the printed language with which they saturate their minds. Yet can any friendship or society be more important to us than that of the books which form so large a part of our minds and even of our characters? Do we in real life take any pleasant fellow to our homes and chat with some agreeable rascal by our firesides, we who will take up any pleasant fellow's printed memoirs, we who delight in the agreeable rascal when he is cut up into pages and bound in calf?

I have no intention to moralise or to indulge in a homily against the reading of what is deliberately evil. There is not so much need for this now, and I am not discoursing on the whole duty of man. I take that part of our reading which is by itself no doubt harmless, entertaining, and even gently instructive. But of this enormous mass of literature how much deserves to be chosen out, to be preferred to all the great books of the world, to be set apart for those precious hours which are all that the most of us can give to solid reading? The vast proportion of books are books that we shall never be able to read. A serious percentage of books are not worth reading at all. The really vital books for us we also know to be a very trifling portion of the whole. And yet we act as if every book were as good as any other, as if it were merely a question of order which we take up first, as if any book were good enough for us, and as if all were alike honourable, precious, and satisfying. Alas! books cannot be more than the men who write them; and as a large proportion of the human race now write books, with motives and objects as various as human activity, books, as books, are entitled *a priori*, until their value is proved, to the same attention and respect as houses, steam-engines, pictures, fiddles, bonnets, and other thoughtful or ornamental products of human industry. In the shelves of those libraries which are our pride, libraries public or private, circulating or very stationary, are to be found those great books of the world *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*, those books which are truly "the precious life-blood of a master spirit." But the very familiarity which their mighty fame has bred in us makes us indifferent; we grow weary of what every one is supposed to have read; and we take down something which looks a little eccentric, or some author on the mere ground that we never heard of him before.

Thus the difficulties of literature are in their way as great as those of the world, the obstacles to finding the right friends are as great, the peril is as great of being lost in a Babel of voices and an ever-changing mass of beings. Books are not wiser than men, the true books are not easier to find than the true men, the bad books or the

vulgar books are not less obtrusive and not less ubiquitous than the bad or vulgar everywhere; the art of right reading is as long and difficult to learn as the art of right living. Those who are on good terms with the first author they meet, run as much risk as men who surrender their time to the first passer in the street; for to be open to every book is for the most part to gain as little as possible from any. A man aimlessly wandering about in a crowded city is of all men the most lonely; so he who takes up only the books that he "comes across," is pretty certain to meet but few that are worth knowing.

Now this danger is one to which we are specially exposed in this age. Our high-pressure life of emergencies, our whirling industrial organization or disorganization, have brought us in this (as in most things) their peculiar difficulties and drawbacks. In almost everything vast opportunities and gigantic means of multiplying our products bring with them new perils and troubles which are often at first neglected. Our huge cities, where wealth is piled up and the requirements and appliances of life extended beyond the dreams of our forefathers, seem to breed in themselves new forms of squalor, disease, blights, or risks to life such as we are yet unable to cope with. So the enormous multiplicity of modern books is not altogether favourable to the knowing of the best. I listen with mixed satisfaction to the pæans that they chant over the works that issue from the press each day, how the books poured forth from Paternoster Row might in a few years be built into a pyramid that would fill the dome of St. Paul's. How in this mountain of literature am I to find the really useful book? How, when I have found it, and found its value, am I to get others to read it? How am I to keep my head clear in the torrent and din of works, all of which distract my attention, most of which promise me something, whilst so few fulfil that promise? The Nile is the source of the Egyptian's bread, and without it he perishes of hunger. But the Nile may be rather too liberal in his flood, and then the Egyptian runs imminent risk of drowning.

And thus there never was a time, at least during the last two hundred years, when the difficulties in the way of making an efficient use of books were greater than they are to-day, when the obstacles were more real between readers and the right books to read, when it was practically so troublesome to find out that which it is of vital importance to know; and that not by the dearth, but by the plethora of printed matter. For it comes to nearly the same thing whether we are actually debarred by physical impossibility from getting the right book into our hand, or whether we are choked off from the right book by the obtrusive crowd of the wrong books; so that it needs a strong character and a resolute system of reading to keep the



head cool in the storm of literature around us. We read nowadays in the market-place—I would rather say in some large steam factory of letter-press, where damp sheets of new print whirl round us perpetually—if it be not rather some noisy book-fair where literary showmen tempt us with performing dolls, and the gongs of rival booths are stunning our ears from morn till night. Contrast with this pandemonium of Leipsic and Paternoster Row the sublime picture of our Milton in his early retirement at Horton, when, musing over his coming flight to the epic heaven, practising his pinions, as he tells Diodati, he consumed five years of solitude in reading over the whole of the ancient writers:—

“Et totum rapiunt, me, mea vita, libri.”

Who now reads the whole of the ancient writers? Who systematically reads the great writers, be they ancient or modern, whom the consent of ages has marked out as classics: typical, immortal, peculiar teachers of our race? Alas! the *Paradise Lost* is lost again to us beneath an inundation of graceful academic verse, sugary stanzas of ladylike prettiness, and ceaseless explanations in more or less readable prose of what John Milton meant or did not mean, or what he saw or did not see, or why Adam or Satan is like that, or unlike the other. We read a perfect library about the *Paradise Lost*, but the *Paradise Lost* itself we do not read.

I am not presumptuous enough to assert that the larger part of modern literature is not worth reading in itself, that the prose is not readable, entertaining, one may say highly instructive. Nor do I pretend that the verses which we read so zealously in place of Milton's are not good verses. On the contrary I think them sweetly conceived, as musical and as graceful as the verse of any age in our history. I say it emphatically, a great deal of our modern literature is such that it is exceedingly difficult to resist it, and it is undeniable that it gives us real information. It seems perhaps unreasonable to many, to assert that a decent readable book which gives us actual instruction can be otherwise than a useful companion, and a solid gain. I dare say many people are ready to cry out upon me as an obscurantist for venturing to doubt a genial confidence in all literature simply as such. But the question which weighs upon me with such really crushing urgency is this:—what are the books that in our little remnant of reading time it is most vital for us to know? For the true use of books is of such sacred value to us that to be simply entertained is to cease to be taught, elevated, inspired by books; merely to gather information of a chance kind is to close the mind to knowledge of the urgent kind. Every book that we take up without a purpose is an opportunity lost of taking up a book with a purpose—every bit of stray information which we cram into our

heads without any sense of its importance, is for the most part a bit of the most useful information driven out of our heads and choked off from our minds. It is so certain that information, *i.e.* the knowledge, the stored thoughts and observations of mankind, is now grown to proportions so utterly incalculable and prodigious, that even the learned whose lives are given to study can but pick up some crumbs that fall from the table of truth. They delve and tend but a plot in that vast and teeming kingdom, whilst those, whom active life leaves with but a few cramped hours of study, can hardly come to know the very vastness of the field before them, or how infinitesimally small is the corner they can traverse at the best. We know all is not of equal value. We know that books differ in value as much as diamonds differ from the sand on the seashore, as much as our living friend differs from a dead rat. We know that much in the myriad-peopled world of books—very much in all kinds—is trivial, enervating, inane, even noxious. And thus, where we have infinite opportunities of wasting our efforts to no end, of fatiguing our minds without enriching them, of clogging the spirit without satisfying it, there, I cannot but think, the very infinity of opportunities is robbing us of the actual power of using them. And thus I come often, in my less hopeful moods, to watch the remorseless cataract of daily literature which thunders over the remnants of the past, as if it were a fresh impediment to the men of our day in the way of systematic knowledge and consistent powers of thought: as if it were destined one day to overwhelm the great inheritance of mankind in prose and verse.

I remember, when I was a very young man at college, that a youth, in no spirit of paradox but out of plenary conviction, undertook to maintain before a body of serious students, the astounding proposition that the invention of printing had been one of the greatest misfortunes that had ever befallen mankind. He argued that exclusive reliance on printed matter had destroyed the higher method of oral teaching, the dissemination of thought by the spoken word to the attentive ear. He insisted that the formation of a vast literary class looking to the making of books as a means of making money, rather than as a social duty, had multiplied books for the sake of the writers rather than for the sake of the readers; that the reliance on books as a cheap and common resource had done much to weaken the powers of memory; that it destroyed the craving for a general culture of taste, and the need of artistic expression in all the surroundings of life. And he argued, lastly, that the sudden multiplication of all kinds of printed matter had been fatal to the orderly arrangement of thought, and had hindered a system of knowledge and a scheme of education.

I am far from sharing this immature view. Of course I hold the

invention of printing to have been one of the most momentous facts in the whole history of man. Without it universal social progress, true democratic enlightenment, and the education of the people would have been impossible, or very slow, even if the cultured few, as is likely, could have advanced the knowledge of mankind without it. We place Gutemberg amongst the small list of the unique and special benefactors of mankind, in the sacred choir of those whose work transformed the conditions of life, whose work, once done, could never be repeated. And no doubt the things which our ardent friend regarded as so fatal a disturbance of society were all inevitable and necessary, part of the great revolution of mind through which men grew out of the mediæval incompleteness to a richer conception of life and of the world.

Yet there is a sense in which this boyish anathema against printing may be true to us by our own fault. We may create for ourselves these very evils. For this I hold, that the art of printing has not been a gift wholly unmixed with evils; that it must be used wisely if it is to be a boon to man at all; that it entails on us heavy responsibilities, resolution to use it with judgment and self-control, and the will to resist its temptations and its perils. Indeed we may easily so act that we may make it a clog on the progress of the human mind, a real curse and not a boon. The power of flying at will through space would probably extinguish civilisation and society, for it would release us from the wholesome bondage of localities. The power of hearing every word that had ever been uttered on this planet would annihilate thought, as the power of knowing all recorded facts by the process of turning a handle would annihilate true science. Our human faculties and our mental forces are not enlarged simply by multiplying our materials of knowledge and our facilities for communication. Telephones, microphones, pantoscopes, steam-presses, and ubiquity-engines in general, may, after all, leave the poor human brain panting and throbbing under the strain of its appliances, and get no bigger and no stronger than the brains of the men who heard Moses speak, and saw Aristotle and Archimedes pondering over a few worn rolls of crabbed manuscript. Until some new Newton or Watt can invent a machine for magnifying the human mind, every fresh apparatus for multiplying its work is a fresh strain on the mind, a new realm for it to order and to rule.

And so, I say it most confidently, the first intellectual task of our age is rightly to order and make serviceable the vast realm of printed material which four centuries have swept across our path. To organize our knowledge, to systematise our reading, to save, out of the relentless cataract of ink, the immortal thoughts of the greatest—this is a necessity, unless the productive ingenuity of man

is to lead us at last to a measureless and pathless chaos. To know anything that turns up is, in the infinity of knowledge, to know nothing. To read the first book we come across, in the wilderness of books, is to learn nothing. To turn over the pages of ten thousand volumes is to be practically indifferent to all that is good.

But this warns me that I am entering on a subject which is far too big and solemn for us to touch to-night. I have no pretension to deal with it as it needs. It is plain, I think, that to organize our knowledge, even to systematise our reading, to make a working selection of books for general study, really implies a complete scheme of education. A scheme of education ultimately implies a system of philosophy, a view of man's duty and powers as a moral and social being—a religion, in fact. Before a problem so great as this, on which a general audience has such different ideas and wants, and differs so profoundly on the very premisses from which we start, before such a problem as a general theory of education, I prefer to retire. I will keep silence even from good words. I have chosen my own part, and adopted my own teacher. But to ask men to adopt the education of Auguste Comte, is almost to ask them to adopt Positivism itself.

Nor will I enlarge on the matter for thought, for foreboding, almost for despair, that is presented to us by the fact of our familiar literary ways and our recognised literary profession. That things infinitely trifling in themselves: men, events, societies, phenomena, in no way otherwise more valuable than the myriad other things which flit around us like the sparrows on the housetop, should be glorified, magnified, and perpetuated, set under a literary microscope and focussed in the blaze of a literary magic-lantern—not for what they are in themselves, but solely to amuse and excite the world by showing how it can be done—all this is to me so amazing, so heart-breaking, that I forbear now to treat it, as I cannot say all that I would.

I pass from all systems of education—from thought of social duty, from meditation on the profession of letters—to more general and lighter topics. I will deal now only with the easier side of reading, with matter on which there is some common agreement in the world. I am very far from meaning that our whole time spent with books is to be given to study. Far from it. I put the poetic and emotional side of literature as the most needed for daily use. I take the books that seek to rouse the imagination, to stir up feeling, touch the heart: the books of art, of fancy, of ideals, such as reflect the delight and aroma of life. And here how does the trivial, provided it is the new, that which stares at us in the advertising columns of the day, crowd out the immortal poetry and pathos of the human race, vitiating our taste for those exquisite pieces which are a household

word, and weakening our mental relish for the eternal works of genius! Old Homer is the very fountain-head of pure poetic enjoyment, of all that is spontaneous, simple, native, and dignified in life. He takes us into the ambrosial world of heroes, of human vigour, of purity, of grace. Now Homer is one of the few poets the life of whom can be fairly preserved in a translation. Most men and women can say that they have read Homer, just as most of us can say that we have studied Johnson's Dictionary. But how few of us take him up, time after time, with fresh delight! How few have even read the entire Iliad and Odyssey through! Whether in the resounding lines of the old Greek, as fresh and ever-stirring as the waves that tumble on the seashore, filling the soul with satisfying silent wonder at its restless unison; whether in the quaint lines of Chapman, or the clarion couplets of Pope, or the closer versions of Cowper, Lord Derby, of Philip Worsley, or even in the new prose version of the Odyssey, Homer is always fresh and rich. And yet how seldom does one find a friend spell-bound over the Greek Bible of antiquity, whilst they wade through torrents of magazine quotations from a petty versifier of to-day, and in an idle vacation will graze, as contentedly as cattle in a fresh meadow, through the chopped straw of a circulating library. A generation which will listen to *Pinafore* for three hundred nights, and will read M. Zola's seventeenth romance, can no more read Homer than it could read a cuneiform inscription. It will read about Homer just as it will read about a cuneiform inscription, and will crowd to see a few pots which probably came from the neighbourhood of Troy. But to Homer and the primeval type of heroic man in his beauty, and his simpleness, and joyousness, the cultured generation is really dead, as completely as some spoiled beauty of the ball-room is dead to the bloom of the heather or the waving of the daffodils in a glade.

It is a true psychological problem, this nausea which idle culture seems to produce for all that is manly and pure in heroic poetry. One knows—at least every schoolboy has known—that a passage of Homer, rolling along in the hexameter or trumpeted out by Pope, will give one a hot glow of pleasure and raise a finer throb in the pulse; one knows that Homer is the easiest, most artless, most diverting of all poets; that the fiftieth reading rouses the spirit even more than the first—and yet we find ourselves (we are all alike) painfully psha-ing over some new and uncut barley-sugar in rhyme, which a man in the street asked us if we had read, or it may be some learned lucubration about the site of Troy by some one we chanced to meet at dinner. It is an unwritten chapter in the history of the human mind, how this literary prurience after new print unmans us for the enjoyment of the old songs chanted forth in the sunrise of human imagination. To ask a man or woman who spends half a

lifetime in sucking magazines and new poems to read a book of Homer, would be like asking a butcher's boy to whistle "Adelaida." The noises and sights and talk, the whirl and volatility of life around us, are too strong for us. A society which is for ever gossiping in a sort of perpetual "drum," loses the very faculty of caring for anything but "early copies" and the last tale out. Thus, like the tares in the noble parable of the Sower, a perpetual chatter about books chokes the seed which is sown in the greatest books of the world.

I speak of Homer, but fifty other great poets and creators of eternal beauty would serve my argument as well. Take the latest perhaps in the series of the world-wide and immortal poets of the whole human race—Walter Scott. We all read Scott's romances, as we have all read Hume's History of England, but how often do we read them, how zealously, with what sympathy and understanding? I am told that the last discovery of modern culture is that Scott's prose is commonplace; that the young men at our universities are far too critical to care for his artless sentences and flowing descriptions. They prefer Mr. Swinburne, Mr. Mallock, and the Euphuism of young Oxford, just as some people prefer a Dresden Shephordess to the Caryatides of the Erietheum, pronounce Fielding to be low, and Mozart to be *passé*. As boys love lollypops, so these juvenile fops love to roll phrases about under the tongue, as if phrases in themselves had a value apart from thoughts, feelings, great conceptions, or human sympathy. For Scott is just one of the poets (we may call poets all the great creators in prose or in verse) of whom one never wearies, just as one can listen to Beethoven or watch the sunrise or the sunset day by day with new delight. I think I can read the *Antiquary*, or the *Bride of Lammermoor*, *Ivanhoe*, *Quentin Durward*, and *Old Mortality*, at least once a year afresh. Now Scott is a perfect library in himself. A constant reader of romances would find that it needed months to go through even the best pieces of the inexhaustible painter of eight full centuries and every type of man; and he might repeat the process of reading him ten times in a lifetime without a sense of fatigue or sameness. The poetic beauty of Scott's creations is almost the least of his great qualities. It is the universality of his sympathy that is so truly great, the justice of his estimates, the insight into the spirit of each age, his intense absorption of self in the vast epic of human civilisation. What are the old almanacs that they so often give us as histories beside these living pictures of the ordered succession of ages? As in Homer himself, we see in this prose Iliad of modern history, the battle of the old and the new, the heroic defence of ancient strongholds, the long impending and inevitable doom of mediæval life. Strong men and proud women struggle

against the destiny of modern society, unconsciously working out its ways, undauntedly defying its power. How just is our island Homer ! Neither Greek nor Trojan sways him ; Achilles is his hero ; Hector is his favourite ; he loves the councils of chiefs, and the palace of Priam ; but the swine-herd, the charioteer, the slave-girl, the hound, the beggar, and the herdsman all glow alike in the harmonious colouring of his peopled epic. We see the dawn of our English nation, the defence of Christendom against the Koran, the grace and the terror of foudalism, the rise of monarchy out of baronies, the rise of parliaments out of monarchy, the rise of industry out of serfage, the pathetic ruin of chivalry, the splendid death-struggle of Catholicism, the sylvan tribes of the mountain (remnants of our pre-historic forefathers) beating themselves to pieces against the hard advance of modern industry ; we see the grim heroism of the Bible-martyrs, the catastrophe of feudalism overwhelmed by a practical age which knew little of its graces and almost nothing of its virtues. Such is Scott, who we may say has done for the various phases of modern history, what Shakespeare has done for the manifold types of human character. And this glorious and most human and most historical of poets, without whom our very conception of human development would have ever been imperfect, this manliest, and truest, and widest of romancers we neglect for some hothouse hybrid of psychological analysis, for the wretched imitators of Balzac, and the jackanapes phrasemongering of some Osric of the day, who assures us that Scott is an absolute Philistine.

In speaking with enthusiasm of Scott, as of Homer, or of Shakespeare, or of Milton, or of any of the accepted masters of the world, I have no wish to insist dogmatically upon any single name, or two or three in particular. Our enjoyment and reverence of the great poets of the world is seriously injured nowadays by the habit we get of singling out some particular quality, some particular school of art, for intemperate praise, or, still worse, for intemperate abuse. Mr. Ruskin, I suppose, is answerable for the taste for this one-sided and spasmodic criticism ; and every young gentleman who has the trick of a few adjectives will languidly vow that Marlowe is supreme, or Murillo foul. It is the mark of rational criticism, as well as of healthy thought, to maintain an evenness of mind in judging of great works, to recognise great qualities in due proportion, to feel that defects are made up by beauties, and beauties are often balanced by weakness. The true judgment implies a weighing of each work and each workman as a whole, in relation to the sum of human cultivation and the gradual advance of the movement of ages. And in this matter we shall usually find that the world is right, the world of the modern centuries and the nations of Europe together. It is unlikely, to say the least of it, that a young person who has hardly

ceased making Latin verses will be able to reverse the decisions of the civilised world; and it is even more unlikely that Milton and Molière, Fielding and Scott, will ever be displaced by a poet who has unaccountably lain hid for one or two centuries. I know, that in the style of to-day, I ought hardly to venture to address you about poetry unless I am prepared to unfold to you the mysterious beauties of some unknown genius who has recently been unearthed by the Children of Light and Sweetness. I confess I have no such discovery to announce. I prefer to dwell in Gath and to pitch my tents in Ashdod; and I doubt the use of the sling as a weapon in modern war. I decline to go into hyperbolic eccentricities over unknown geniuses, and a single quality or power is not enough to rouse my enthusiasm. It is possible that no master ever painted a buttercup like this one, or the fringe of a robe like that one; that this poet has a unique subtlety, and that an undefinable music. I am still unconvinced, though the man who cannot see it, we are told, should at once retire to the place where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth.

I am against all gnashing of teeth, whether for or against a particular idol. I stand by the men, and by all the men, who have moved mankind to the depths of their souls, who have taught generations, and formed our life. If I say of Scott, that to have drunk in the whole of his glorious spirit is a liberal education in itself, I am asking for no exclusive devotion to Scott, to any poet, or any school of poets, or any age, or any country, to any style or any order of poet, one more than another. They are as various, fortunately, and as many-sided as human nature itself. If I delight in Scott, I love Fielding, and Richardson, and Sterne, and Goldsmith, and Defoe. Yes, and I will add Cooper and Marryat, Miss Edgeworth and Miss Austen—to confine myself to those who are already classics, to our own country, and to one form of art alone, and not to venture on the ground of contemporary romance in general. What I have said of Homer, I would say in a degree but somewhat lower, of those great ancients who are the most accessible to us in English—Æschylus, Aristophanes, Virgil, and Horace. What I have said of Shakespeare I would say of Calderon, of Molière, of Corneille, of Racine, of Voltaire, of Alfieri, of Goethe, of those dramatists, in many forms, and with genius the most diverse, who have so steadily set themselves to idealise the great types of public life and of the phases of human history. Let us all beware lest worship of the idiosyncrasy of our peerless Shakespeare blind us to the value of the great masters who in a different world and with different aims have presented the development of civilisation in a series of dramas, where the unity of a few great types of man and of society is made paramount to subtlety of character or brilliancy of language. What



I have said of Milton, I would say of Dante, of Ariosto, of Petrarch, and of Tasso; nor less would I say it of Boccaccio and Chaucer, of Camoens and Spenser, of Rabelais and of Cervantes, of Gil Blas and the Vicar of Wakefield, of Byron and of Shelley, of Goethe and of Schiller. Nor let us forget those wonderful idealisations of awakening thought and primitive societies, the pictures of other races and types of life removed from our own: all those primæval legends, ballads, songs, and tales, those proverbs, apologues, and maxims, which have come down to us from distant ages of man's history—the old idylls and myths of the Hebrew race; the tales of Greece, of the Middle Ages, of the East; the fables of the old and the new world; the songs of the Nibelungs; the romances of early feudalism; the Morte d'Arthur; the Arabian Nights; the Ballads of the early nations of Europe.

I protest that I am devoted to no school in particular: I condemn no school, I reject none. I am for the school of all the great men; and I am against the school of the smaller men. I care for Wordsworth as well as for Byron, for Burns as well as Shelley, for Boccaccio as well as for Milton, for Bunyan as well as Rabelais, for Cervantes as much as for Dante, for Corneille as well as for Shakespeare, for Goldsmith as well as Goethe. I stand by the sentence of the world; and I hold that in a matter so human and so broad as the highest poetry the judgment of the nations of Europe is pretty well settled, at any rate after a century or two of continuous reading and discussing. Let those who will assure us that no one can pretend to culture, unless he swear by Fra Angelico and Sandro Botticelli, by Arnolpho the son of Lapo, or the Lombardic bricklayers, by Martini and Galuppi (all, by the way, admirable men of the second rank); and so, in literature and poetry, there are some who will hear of nothing but Webster or Marlowe; Blake, Herrick, or Keats; William Langland or the Earl of Surrey; Heine or Omar Kayam. All of these are men of genius, and each with a special and inimitable gift of his own. But the busy world, which does not hunt poets as collectors hunt for curios, may fairly reserve those lesser lights for the time when they know the greatest well.

So, I say, think mainly of the greatest, of the best known, of those who cover the largest area of human history and man's common nature. Now when we come to count up these names accepted by the unanimous voice of Europe, we have some thirty or forty names, and amongst them are some of the most voluminous of writers. I have been running over but one department of literature alone, the poetic. I have been naming those only, whose names are household words with us, and the poets for the most part of modern Europe. Yet even here we have a list which is usually found in not less than a hundred volumes at least. Now poetry and the highest kind of

romance are exactly that order of literature, which not only will bear to be read many times, but that of which the true value can only be gained by frequent, and indeed habitual, reading. A man can hardly be said to know the 12th Mass or the 9th Symphony, by virtue of having once heard them played ten years ago; he can hardly be said to take air and exercise because he took a country-walk once last autumn. And so, he can hardly be said to know Scott, or Shakespeare, Molière, or Cervantes, when he once read them since the close of his school days, or amidst the daily grind of his professional life. The immortal and universal poets of our race are to be read and re-read till their music and their spirit are a part of our nature; they are to be thought over and digested till we live in the world they created for us; they are to be read devoutly, as devout men read their Bible and fortify their hearts with psalms. For as the old Hebrew singer heard the heavens declare the glory of their maker, and the firmament showing his handiwork, so in the long roll of poetry we see transfigured the strength and beauty of humanity, the joys and sorrows, the dignity and struggles, the long life-history of our common kind.

I have said but little of the more difficult poetry, and the religious meditations of the great idealists in prose and verse, whom it needs a concentrated study to master. Some of these are hard to all men, and at all seasons. The Divine Comedy, in its way, reaches as deep in its thoughtfulness as Descartes himself. But these books, if they are difficult to all, are impossible to the gluttons of the circulating library. To these munchers of vapid memoirs and monotonous tales such books are closed indeed. The power of enjoyment and of understanding is withered up within them. To the besotted gambler on the turf the lonely hillside glowing with heather grows to be as dreary as a prison; and so too, a man may listen nightly to burlesques, till *Fidelio* inflicts on him intolerable fatigue. One may be a devourer of books, and be actually incapable of reading a hundred lines of the wisest and the most beautiful. To read one of such books comes only by habit, as prayer is impossible to one who habitually dreads to be alone.

In an age of steam it seems almost idle to speak of Dante, the most profound, the most meditative, the most prophetic of all poets, in whose epic the panorama of mediæval life, of feudalism at its best and Christianity at its best, stands, as in a microcosm, transfigured, judged, and measured. To most men, the *Paradise Lost*, with all its mighty music and its idyllic pictures of human nature, of our first child-parents in their naked purity and their awakening thought, is a serious and ungrateful task—not to be ranked with the simple enjoyments: it is a possession to be acquired only by habit. The great religious poets, the imaginative teachers of the

heart, are never easy reading. But the reading of them is a religious habit, rather than an intellectual effort. I pretend not to-night to be dealing with a matter so deep and high as religion, or indeed with education in the fuller sense. I will say nothing of that side of reading which is really hard study, an effort of duty, matter of meditation and reverential thought. I need speak not to-night of such reading as that of the Bible; the moral reflections of Socrates, of Aristotle, of Confucius; the Confessions of St. Augustine and the City of God; the discourses of St. Bernard, of Bossuet, of Bishop Butler, of Jeremy Taylor; the vast philosophical visions that were opened to the eyes of Bacon and Descartes; the thoughts of Pascal and Vauvenargues, of Diderot and Hume, of Condorcet and de Maistre; the problem of man's nature as it is told in the *Excursion*, or in *Faust*, in *Cain*, or in the *Pilgrim's Progress*; the unsearchable outpouring of the heart in the great mystics, of many ages and many races; be the mysticism that of David or of John; of Mahomet or of Bouddha; of Fénelon or of Shelley.

I pass by all these. For I am speaking now of the use of books in our leisure hours. I will take the books of simple enjoyment, books that one can laugh over and weep over; and learn from, and laugh or weep again; which have in them humour, truth, human nature in all its sides, pictures of the great phases of human history; and withal sound teaching in honesty, manliness, gentleness, patience. Of such books, I say, books accepted by the voice of all mankind as matchless and immortal, there is a complete library at hand for every man, in his every mood, whatever his tastes or his acquirements. To know merely the hundred volumes or so of which I have spoken would involve the study of years. But who can say that these books are read as they might be, that we do not neglect them for something in a new cover, or which catches our eye in a library? It is not merely to the idle and unreading world that this complaint holds good. It is the insatiable readers themselves who so often read to the least profit. Of course they have read all these household books many years ago, read them, and judged them, and put them away for ever. They will read infinite dissertations about these authors; they will write you essays on their works; they will talk most learned criticism about them. But it never occurs to them that such books have a daily and perpetual value, such as the devout Christian finds in his morning and evening psalm; that the music of them has to sink into the soul by continual renewal; that we have to live with them and in them, till their ideal world habitually surrounds us in the midst of the real world; that their great thoughts have to stir us daily anew, and their generous passion has to warm us hour by hour: just as we need each day to have our eyes filled by the light of heaven, and our blood warmed by the glow of the sun. I vow

that, when I see men, forgetful of the perennial poetry of the world, muck-raking in a litter of fugitive refuse, I think of that wonderful scene in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, where the Interpreter shows the wayfarers the old man raking in the straw and dust, whilst he will not see the Angel who offers him a crown of gold and precious stones.

This gold, refined beyond the standard of the goldsmith, these pearls of great price, the united voice of mankind has assured us are found in those immortal works of every age and of every race whose names are household words throughout the world. And we shut our eyes to them for the sake of the straw and litter of the nearest library or bookshop. A lifetime will hardly suffice to know, as they ought to be known, these great masterpieces of man's genius. How many of us can name ten men who may be said entirely to know (in the sense in which a thoughtful Christian knows the Psalms and the Epistles) even a few of the greatest poets? I take them almost at random, and I name Homer, Æschylus, Aristophanes, Virgil, Dante, Ariosto, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Calderon, Corneille, Molière, Milton, Fielding, Goethe, Scott. Of course every one has read these poets, but who really knows them, the whole of them, the whole meaning of them? They are too often taken "as read," as they say in the railway meetings.

Take of this immortal choir the liveliest, the easiest, the most familiar, take for the moment the three—Cervantes, Molière, Fielding. Here we have three poets who unite the profoundest insight into human nature with the most inimitable wit: *Penseroso* and *L'Allegro* in one; "sober, steadfast, and demure," and yet with "Laughter holding both his sides." And in all three, different as they are, is an unfathomable pathos, a brotherly pity for all human weakness, spontaneous sympathy with all human goodness. To know *Don Quixote*, that is to follow out the whole mystery of its double world, is to know the very tragi-comedy of human life, the contrast of the ideal with the real, of chivalry with good sense, of heroic failure with vulgar utility, of the past with the present, of the impossible sublime with the possible commonplace. And yet to how many reading men is *Don Quixote* little more than a book to laugh over in boyhood! So Molière is read or witnessed; we laugh and we praise. But how little do we study with insight that elaborate gallery of human character; those consummate types of almost every social phenomenon; that genial and just judge of imposture, folly, vanity, affectation, and insincerity; that tragic picture of the brave man born out of his time, too proud and too just to be of use in his age! Was ever truer word said than that about Fielding as "the prose Homer of human nature?" And yet how often do we forget in *Tom Jones* the beauty of unselfishness, the well-spring of good-

ness, the tenderness, the manly healthiness and heartiness underlying its frolic and its satire, because we are absorbed, it may be, in laughing at its humour, or are simply irritated by its grossness! Nay, *Robinson Crusoe* contains (not for boys but for men) more religion, more philosophy, more psychology, more political economy, more anthropology, than are found in many elaborate treatises on these special subjects. And yet, I imagine, grown men do not often read *Robinson Crusoe* as the article has it, "for instruction of life and ensample of manners." The great books of the world we have once read; we take them as read; we believe that we read them; at least, we believe that we know them. But to how few of us are they the daily mental food! For once that we take down our Milton, and read a book of that "voice," as Wordsworth says, "whose sound is like the sea," we take up fifty times a magazine with something about Milton, or about Milton's grandmother, or a book stuffed with curious facts about the houses in which he lived, and the juvenile ailments of his first wife.

And whilst the roll of the great men yet unread is to all of us so long, whilst years are not enough to master the very least of them, we are incessantly searching the earth for something new or strangely forgotten. Brilliant essays are for ever extolling some minor light. It becomes the fashion to grow rapturous about the obscure Elizabethan dramatists; about the note of refinement in the lesser men of Queen Anne; it is pretty to swear by Lyly's *Euphues* and Sidney's *Arcadia*; to vaunt Lovelace and Herrick, Marvell and Donne, Robert Burton and Sir Thomas Browne. All of them are excellent men, who have written delightful things, that may very well be enjoyed when we have utterly exhausted the best. But when one meets bebies of hyper-æsthetic young maidens, in lack-a-daisical gowns, who simper about Greene and John Ford (authors, let us trust, that they never have read) one wonders if they all know *Lear* or ever heard of *Alceste*. Since to nine out of ten of the "general readers," the very best is as yet more than they have managed to assimilate, this fidgeting after something curious is a little premature and perhaps artificial.

For this reason I stand amazed at the lengths of fantastic curiosity to which persons, far from learned, have pushed the mania for collecting rare books, or prying into out-of-the-way holes and corners of literature. They conduct themselves as if all the works attainable by ordinary diligence were to them sucked as dry as an orange. Says one, "I came across a very curious book, mentioned in a parenthesis in the *Religio Medici*: only one other copy exists in this country." I will not mention the work to-night, because I know that, if I did, to-morrow morning at least fifty libraries would be ransacked for it, which would be unpardonable waste of time. "I

am bringing out," says another quite simply, "the lives of the washerwomen of the Queens of England." And when it comes out we shall have a copious collection of washing-books some centuries old, and at length understand the mode of ironing a ruff in the early mediæval period. A very learned friend of mine thinks it perfectly monstrous that a public library should be without an adequate collection of works in Dutch, though I believe he is the only frequenter of it who can read that language. Not long ago I procured for a Russian scholar a manuscript copy of a very rare work by Greene, the contemporary of Shakespeare. Greene's *Funeralls* is, I think, as dismal and worthless a set of lines as one often sees; and as it has slumbered for nearly three hundred years, I should be willing to let it be its own undertaker. But this unsavoury carrion is at last to be dug out of its grave; for it is now translated into Russian and published in Moscow (to the honour and glory of the Russian professor) in order to delight and inform the Muscovite public, where perhaps not ten in a million can as much as read Shakespeare. This or that collector again, with the labour of half a lifetime and by means of half his fortune, has amassed a library of old plays, every one of them worthless in diction, in plot, in sentiment, and in purpose; a collection far more stupid and uninteresting in fact than the burlesques and pantomimes of the last fifty years. And yet this insatiable student of old plays will probably know less of Molière and Alfieri than Molière's housekeeper or Alfieri's valet; and possibly he has never looked into such poets as Calderon and Vondel.

Collecting rare books and forgotten authors is perhaps of all the collecting manias the most foolish in our day. There is much to be said for rare china and curious beetles. The china is occasionally beautiful; and the beetles at least are droll. But rare books now are, by the nature of the case, worthless books; and their rarity usually consists in this, that the printer made a blunder in the text, or that they contain something exceptionally nasty or silly. To affect a profound interest in neglected authors and uncommon books, is a sign for the most part—not that a man has exhausted the resources of ordinary literature—but that he has no real respect for the greatest productions of the greatest men of the world. This bibliomania seizes hold of rational beings and so perverts them, that in the sufferer's mind the human race exists for the sake of the books, and not the books for the sake of the human race. There is one book they might read to good purpose, the doings of a great book collector—who once lived in La Mancha. To the collector, and sometimes to the scholar, the book becomes a fetich or idol, and is worthy of the worship of mankind, even if it cannot be the slightest use to anybody. As the book exists, it must have the compliment

paid it of being invited to the shelves. The "library is imperfect without it," although the library will, so to speak, stink when it has got it. The great books are of course the common books; and these are treated by collectors and librarians with sovereign contempt. The more dreadful an abortion of a book the rare volume may be, the more desperate is the struggle of libraries to possess it. Civilisation in fact has evolved a complete apparatus, an order of men, and a code of ideas, for the express purpose one may say of degrading the great books. It suffocates them under mountains of little books, and gives the place of honour to that which is plainly literary carrion.

Now I suppose, at the bottom of all this, lies that rattle and restlessness of life which belongs to the industrial Maelström wherein we ever revolve. And connected therewith comes also that literary dandyism, which results from the pursuit of letters without any social purpose or any systematic faith. To read from the pricking of some cerebral itch rather than from a desire of forming judgments; to get, like an Alpine club stripling, to the top of some unscaled pinnacle of culture; to use books as a sedative, as a means of exciting a mild intellectual titillation, instead of as a means of elevating the nature; to dribble on in a perpetual literary gossip, in order to avoid the effort of bracing the mind to think—such is our habit in an age of utterly chaotic education. We read, as the bereaved poet made rhymes—

"For the unquiet heart and brain,  
A use in measured language lies;  
The sad mechanic exercise,  
Like dull narcotics, numbing pain."

We, for whom steam and electricity have done almost everything except give us bigger brains and hearts, who have a new invention ready for every meeting of the Royal Institution, who want new things to talk about faster than children want new toys to break, we cannot take up the books we have seen about us since our childhood: Milton, or Molière, or Scott. It feels like donning knee-breeches and buckles, to read what everybody has read, that everybody can read, and which our very fathers thought good entertainment scores of years ago. Hard-worked men and over-wrought women crave an occupation which shall free them from their thoughts and yet not take them from their world. And thus it comes that we need at least a thousand new books every season, whilst we have rarely a spare hour left for the greatest of all. But I am getting into a vein too serious for our purpose: education is a long and thorny topic. I will cite but the words on this head of the great Bishop Butler. "The great number of books and papers of amusement which, of one kind or another, daily come in

one's way, have in part occasioned, and most perfectly fall in with and humour, this idle way of reading and considering things. By this means time, even in solitude, is happily got rid of, without the pain of attention ; neither is any part of it more put to the account of idleness, one can scarce forbear saying, is spent with less thought, than great part of that which is spent in reading." But this was written exactly a century and a half ago, in 1729 ; since which date, let us trust, the multiplicity of print and the habits of desultory reading have considerably abated.

A philosopher with whom I hold (but with whose opinions I have no present intention of troubling you) has proposed a method of dealing with this indiscriminate use of books, which I think is worthy of attention. He has framed a short collection of books for constant and general reading. He put it forward "with the view of guiding the more thoughtful minds among the people in their choice for constant use." He declares that, "both the intellect and the moral character suffer grievously at the present time from irregular reading." It was not intended to put a bar upon other reading, or to supersede special study. It is designed as a type of a healthy and rational syllabus of essential books, fit for common teaching and daily use. It presents a working epitome of what is best and most enduring in the literature of the world. The entire collection would form in the shape in which books now exist in modern libraries, something like five hundred volumes. They embrace books both of ancient and modern times, in all the five principal languages of modern Europe. It is divided into four sections:—Poetry, Science, History, Religion.

The principles on what it is framed are these : First it collects the best in all the great departments of human thought, so that no part of education shall be wholly wanting. Next it puts together the greatest books, of universal and permanent value, and the greatest and the most enduring only. Next it measures the greatness of books not by their brilliancy, or even their learning, but by their power of presenting some typical chapter in thought, some dominant phase of history ; or else it measures them by their power of idealising man and nature, or of giving harmony to our moral and intellectual activity. Lastly, the test of the general value of books is the permanent relation they bear to the common civilisation of Europe.

Some such firm foot-hold in the vast and increasing torrent of literature it is certainly urgent to find, unless all that is great in literature is to be borne away in the flood of books. With this, we may avoid an interminable wandering over a pathless waste of waters. Without it, we may read everything and know nothing ; we may be curious about anything that chances, and indifferent to every-



thing that profits. Having such a catalogue before our eyes, with its perpetual warning—*non multa sed multum*—we shall see how with our insatiable consumption of print we wander, like unclassed spirits, round the outskirts only of those Elysian fields where the great dead dwell and hold high converse. As it is we hear but in a faint echo that voice which cries :—

“Onorate l’altissimo Poeta :  
L’ombra sua torna, ch’era dipartita.”

We need to be reminded every day, how many are the books of inimitable glory, which, with all our eagerness after reading, we have never taken in our hands. It will astonish most of us to find how much of our very industry is given to the books which leave no mark, how often we rake in the litter of the printing-press, whilst a crown of gold and rubies is offered us in vain.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

POSTSCRIPT.—I shall take the earliest opportunity of presenting, with some explanation or introduction, the library of Augusto Comte, which forms the basis of the whole of my lecture above. The catalogue is to be found in many of his publications, as the *Catechism*, Trübner and Co. (translated. London, 1858); and also in the fourth volume of the *Positive Polity* (translated. London, 1877), pp. 352, 483, where its use and meaning are explained. Those who may take an erroneous idea of its purpose, and may think that such a catalogue would serve in the way of an ordinary circulating library, may need to be reminded that it is designed as the basis of a scheme of education, for one particular system of philosophy, and as the manual of an organized form of religion. It is, in fact, the literary resumé of Positivist teaching; and as such alone can it be used. It is, moreover, designed to be of common use to all Western Europe, and to be ultimately extended to all classes. It is essentially a people’s library for popular instruction; it is of permanent use only; and it is intended to serve as a type. Taken in connection with the *Calendar*, which contains the names of nearly two hundred and fifty authors, it may serve as a guide of the books “that the world would not willingly let die.” But it must be remembered that it has no special relation to current views of education, to English literature, much less to the literature of the day. It was drawn up nearly thirty years ago by a French philosopher, who passed his life in Paris, and who had read no new books for twenty years. And it was designedly limited by him to such a compass that hard-worked men might hope to master it; in order to give them an *aperçu* of what the ancient and the modern world had left of most great in each language and in each department of thought. To attempt to use it, or to judge it, from any point of view but this, would be entirely to mistake its character and object.

The collection itself may be found at the Positivist School, 19, Chapel Street, W.C.

## CHAPTERS ON SOCIALISM.<sup>1</sup>

BY JOHN STUART MILL.

---

### THE DIFFICULTIES OF SOCIALISM.

AMONG those who call themselves Socialists, two kinds of persons may be distinguished. There are, in the first place, those whose plans for a new order of society, in which private property and individual competition are to be superseded and other motives to action substituted, are on the scale of a village community or township, and would be applied to an entire country by the multiplication of such self-acting units; of this character are the systems of Owen, of Fourier, and the more thoughtful and philosophic Socialists generally. The other class, who are more a product of the Continent than of Great Britain and may be called the revolutionary Socialists, propose to themselves a much bolder stroke. Their scheme is the management of the whole productive resources of the country by one central authority, the general government. And with this view some of them avow as their purpose that the working classes, or somebody in their behalf, should take possession of all the property of the country, and administer it for the general benefit.

Whatever be the difficulties of the first of these two forms of Socialism, the second must evidently involve the same difficulties and many more. The former, too, has the great advantage that it can be brought into operation progressively, and can prove its capabilities by trial. It can be tried first on a select population and extended to others as their education and cultivation permit. It need not, and in the natural order of things would not, become an engine of subversion until it had shown itself capable of being also a means of reconstruction. It is not so with the other: the aim of that is to substitute the new rule for the old at a single stroke, and to exchange the amount of good realised under the present system, and its large possibilities of improvement, for a plunge without any preparation into the most extreme form of the problem of carrying on the whole round of the operations of social life without the motive power which has always hitherto worked the social machinery. It must be acknowledged that those who would play this game on the strength of their own private opinion, unconfirmed as yet by any experimental verification—who would forcibly deprive all who have now a comfortable physical existence of their only present means of

(1) Continued from the *Fortnightly Review* for February and March.

preserving it, and would brave the frightful bloodshed and misery that would ensue if the attempt was resisted—must have a serene confidence in their own wisdom on the one hand and a recklessness of other people's sufferings on the other, which Robespierre and St. Just, hitherto the typical instances of those united attributes, scarcely came up to. Nevertheless this scheme has great elements of popularity which the more cautious and reasonable form of Socialism has not; because what it professes to do it promises to do quickly, and holds out hope to the enthusiastic of seeing the whole of their aspirations realised in their own time and at a blow.

The peculiarities, however, of the revolutionary form of Socialism will be most conveniently examined after the considerations common to both the forms have been duly weighed.

The produce of the world could not attain anything approaching to its present amount, nor support anything approaching to the present number of its inhabitants, except upon two conditions: abundant and costly machinery, buildings, and other instruments of production; and the power of undertaking long operations and waiting a considerable time for their fruits. In other words, there must be a large accumulation of capital, both fixed in the implements and buildings, and circulating, that is, employed in maintaining the labourers and their families during the time which elapses before the productive operations are completed and the products come in. This necessity depends on physical laws, and is inherent in the condition of human life; but these requisites of production, the capital, fixed and circulating, of the country (to which has to be added the land, and all that is contained in it), may either be the collective property of those who use it, or may belong to individuals; and the question is, which of these arrangements is most conducive to human happiness. What is characteristic of Socialism is the joint ownership by all the members of the community of the instruments and means of production; which carries with it the consequence that the division of the produce among the body of owners must be a public act, performed according to rules laid down by the community. Socialism by no means excludes private ownership of articles of consumption; the exclusive right of each to his or her share of the produce when received, either to enjoy, to give, or to exchange it. The land, for example, might be wholly the property of the community for agricultural and other productive purposes, and might be cultivated on their joint account, and yet the dwelling assigned to each individual or family as part of their remuneration might be as exclusively theirs, while they continued to fulfil their share of the common labours, as any one's house now is; and not the dwelling only, but any ornamental ground which the circumstances of the association allowed to be attached to the house for

purposes of enjoyment. The distinctive feature of Socialism is not that all things are in common, but that production is only carried on upon the common account, and that the instruments of production are held as common property. The *practicability* then of Socialism, on the scale of Mr. Owen's or M. Fourier's villages, admits of no dispute. The attempt to manage the whole production of a nation by one central organization is a totally different matter; but a mixed agricultural and manufacturing association of from two thousand to four thousand inhabitants under any tolerable circumstances of soil and climate would be easier to manage than many a joint stock company. The question to be considered is, whether this joint management is likely to be as efficient and successful as the managements of private industry by private capital. And this question has to be considered in a double aspect; the efficiency of the directing mind, or minds, and that of the simple workpeople. And in order to state this question in its simplest form, we will suppose the form of Socialism to be simple Communism, *i.e.* equal division of the produce among all the sharers, or, according to M. Louis Blanc's still higher standard of justice, apportionment of it according to difference of need, but without making any difference of reward according to the nature of the duty nor according to the supposed merits or services of the individual. There are other forms of Socialism, particularly Fourierism, which do, on considerations of justice or expediency, allow differences of remuneration for different kinds or degrees of service to the community; but the consideration of these may be for the present postponed.

The difference between the motive powers in the economy of society under private property and under Communism would be greatest in the case of the directing minds. Under the present system, the direction being entirely in the hands of the person or persons who own (or are personally responsible for) the capital, the whole benefit of the difference between the best administration and the worst under which the business can continue to be carried on accrues to the person or persons who control the administration: they reap the whole profit of good management except so far as their self-interest or liberality induce them to share it with their subordinates; and they suffer the whole detriment of mismanagement except so far as this may cripple their subsequent power of employing labour. This strong personal motive to do their very best and utmost for the efficiency and economy of the operations, would not exist under Communism; as the managers would only receive out of the produce the same equal dividend as the other members of the association. What would remain would be the interest common to all in so managing affairs as to make the dividend as large as possible; the incentives of public spirit, of conscience, and of the honour and

credit of the managers. The force of these motives, especially when combined, is great. But it varies greatly in different persons, and is much greater for some purposes than for others. The verdict of experience, in the imperfect degree of moral cultivation which mankind have yet reached, is that the motive of conscience and that of credit and reputation, even when they are of some strength, are, in the majority of cases, much stronger as restraining than as impelling forces—are more to be depended on for preventing wrong, than for calling forth the fullest energies in the pursuit of ordinary occupations. In the case of most men the only inducement which has been found sufficiently constant and unflagging to overcome the ever-present influence of indolence and love of ease, and induce men to apply themselves unrelaxingly to work for the most part in itself dull and unexciting, is the prospect of bettering their own economic condition and that of their family; and the closer the connection of every increase of exertion with a corresponding increase of its fruits, the more powerful is this motive. To suppose the contrary would be to imply that with men as they now are, duty and honour are more powerful principles of action than personal interest, not solely as to special acts and forbearances respecting which those sentiments have been exceptionally cultivated, but in the regulation of their whole lives; which no one, I suppose, will affirm. It may be said that this inferior efficacy of public and social feelings is not inevitable—is the result of imperfect education. This I am quite ready to admit, and also that there are even now many individual exceptions to the general infirmity. But before these exceptions can grow into a majority, or even into a very large minority, much time will be required. The education of human beings is one of the most difficult of all arts, and this is one of the points in which it has hitherto been least successful; moreover improvements in general education are necessarily very gradual, because the future generation is educated by the present, and the imperfections of the teachers set an invincible limit to the degree in which they can train their pupils to be better than themselves. We must therefore expect, unless we are operating upon a select portion of the population, that personal interest will for a long time be a more effective stimulus to the most vigorous and careful conduct of the industrial business of society than motives of a higher character. It will be said that at present the greed of personal gain by its very excess counteracts its own end by the stimulus it gives to reckless and often dishonest risks. This it does, and under Communism that source of evil would generally be absent. It is probable, indeed, that enterprise either of a bad or of a good kind would be a deficient element, and that business in general would fall very much under the dominion of routine; the rather, as the performance of duty in such communities has to be

enforced by external sanctions, the more nearly each person's duty can be reduced to fixed rules, the easier it is to hold him to its performance. A circumstance which increases the probability of this result is the limited power which the managers would have of independent action. They would of course hold their authority from the choice of the community, by whom their function might at any time be withdrawn from them; and this would make it necessary for them, even if not so required by the constitution of the community, to obtain the general consent of the body before making any change in the established mode of carrying on the concern. The difficulty of persuading a numerous body to make a change in their accustomed mode of working, of which change the trouble is often great, and the risk more obvious to their minds than the advantage, would have a great tendency to keep things in their accustomed track. Against this it has to be set, that choice by the persons who are directly interested in the success of the work, and who have practical knowledge and opportunities of judgment, might be expected on the average to produce managers of greater skill than the chances of birth, which now so often determine who shall be the owner of the capital. This may be true; and though it may be replied that the capitalist by inheritance can also, like the community, appoint a manager more capable than himself, this would only place him on the same level of advantage as the community, not on a higher level. But it must be said on the other side that under the Communist system the persons most qualified for the management would be likely very often to hang back from undertaking it. At present the manager, even if he be a hired servant, has a very much larger remuneration than the other persons concerned in the business; and there are open to his ambition higher social positions to which his function of manager is a stepping-stone. On the Communist system none of these advantages would be possessed by him; he could obtain only the same dividend out of the produce of the community's labour as any other member of it; he would no longer have the chance of raising himself from a receiver of wages into the class of capitalists; and while he could be in no way better off than any other labourer, his responsibilities and anxieties would be so much greater that a large proportion of mankind would be likely to prefer the less onerous position. This difficulty was foreseen by Plato as an objection to the system proposed in his Republic of community of goods among a governing class; and the motive on which he relied for inducing the fit persons to take on themselves, in the absence of all the ordinary inducements, the cares and labours of government, was the fear of being governed by worse men. This, in truth, is the motive which would have to be in the main depended upon; the persons most competent to the management would be

prompted to undertake the office to prevent it from falling into less competent hands. And the motive would probably be effectual at times when there was an impression that by incompetent management the affairs of the community were going to ruin, or even only decidedly deteriorating. But this motive could not, as a rule, expect to be called into action by the less stringent inducement of merely promoting improvement; unless in the case of inventors or schemers eager to try some device from which they hoped for great and immediate fruits; and persons of this kind are very often unfitted by over-sanguine temper and imperfect judgment for the general conduct of affairs, while even when fitted for it they are precisely the kind of persons against whom the average man is apt to entertain a prejudice, and they would often be unable to overcome the preliminary difficulty of persuading the community both to adopt their project and to accept them as managers. Communistic management would thus be, in all probability, less favourable than private management to that striking out of new paths and making immediate sacrifices for distant and uncertain advantages, which, though seldom unattended with risk, is generally indispensable to great improvements in the economic condition of mankind, and even to keeping up the existing state in the face of a continual increase of the number of mouths to be fed.

We have thus far taken account only of the operation of motives upon the managing minds of the association. Let us now consider how the case stands in regard to the ordinary workers.

These, under Communism, would have no interest, except their share of the general interest, in doing their work honestly and energetically. But in this respect matters would be no worse than they now are in regard to the great majority of the producing classes. These, being paid by fixed wages, are so far from having any direct interest of their own in the efficiency of their work, that they have not even that share in the general interest which every worker would have in the Communistic organization. Accordingly, the inefficiency of hired labour, the imperfect manner in which it calls forth the real capabilities of the labourers, is matter of common remark. It is true that a character for being a good workman is far from being without its value, as it tends to give him a preference in employment, and sometimes obtains for him higher wages. There are also possibilities of rising to the position of foreman, or other subordinate administrative posts, which are not only more highly paid than ordinary labour, but sometimes open the way to ulterior advantages. But on the other side is to be set that under Communism the general sentiment of the community, composed of the comrades under whose eyes each person works, would be sure to be in favour of good and hard working, and unfavourable to laziness,

carelessness, and waste. In the present system not only is this not the case, but the public opinion of the workman class often acts in the very opposite direction: the rules of some trade societies actually forbid their members to exceed a certain standard of efficiency, lest they should diminish the number of labourers required for the work; and for the same reason they often violently resist contrivances for economising labour. The change from this to a state in which every person would have an interest in rendering every other person as industrious, skilful, and careful as possible (which would be the case under Communism), would be a change very much for the better.

It is, however, to be considered that the principal defects of the present system in respect to the efficiency of labour may be corrected, and the chief advantages of Communism in that respect may be obtained, by arrangements compatible with private property and individual competition. Considerable improvement is already obtained by piece-work, in the kinds of labour which admit of it. By this the workman's personal interest is closely connected with the quantity of work he turns out—not so much with its quality, the security for which still has to depend on the employer's vigilance; neither does piece-work carry with it the public opinion of the workman class, which is often, on the contrary, strongly opposed to it, as a means of (as they think) diminishing the market for labourers. And there is really good ground for their dislike of piece-work, if, as is alleged, it is a frequent practice of employers, after using piece-work to ascertain the utmost which a good workman can do, to fix the price of piece-work so low that by doing that utmost he is not able to earn more than they would be obliged to give him as day wages for ordinary work.

But there is a far more complete remedy than piece-work for the disadvantages of hired labour, viz. what is now called industrial partnership—the admission of the whole body of labourers to a participation in the profits, by distributing among all who share in the work, in the form of a percentage on their earnings, the whole or a fixed portion of the gains after a certain remuneration has been allowed to the capitalist. This plan has been found of admirable efficacy, both in this country and abroad. It has enlisted the sentiments of the workmen employed on the side of the most careful regard by all of them to the general interest of the concern; and by its joint effect in promoting zealous exertion and checking waste, it has very materially increased the remuneration of every description of labour in the concerns in which it has been adopted. It is evident that this system admits of indefinite extension and of an indefinite increase in the share of profits assigned to the labourers, short of that which would leave to the managers less than the needful degree of personal interest in the success of the concern. It is even likely



that when such arrangements become common, many of these concerns would at some period or another, on the death or retirement of the chiefs, pass, by arrangement, into the state of purely co-operative associations.

It thus appears that as far as concerns the motives to exertion in the general body, Communism has no advantage which may not be reached under private property, while as respects the managing heads it is at a considerable disadvantage. It has also some disadvantages which seem to be inherent in it, through the necessity under which it lies of deciding in a more or less arbitrary manner questions which, on the present system, decide themselves, often badly enough, but spontaneously.

It is a simple rule, and under certain aspects a just one, to give equal payment to all who share in the work. But this is a very imperfect justice unless the work also is apportioned equally. Now the many different kinds of work required in every society are very unequal in hardness and unpleasantness. To measure these against one another, so as to make quality equivalent to quantity, is so difficult that Communists generally propose that all should work by turns at every kind of labour. But this involves an almost complete sacrifice of the economic advantages of the division of employments, advantages which are indeed frequently over-estimated (or rather the counter-considerations are under-estimated) by political economists, but which are nevertheless, in the point of view of the productiveness of labour, very considerable, for the double reason that the co-operation of employment enables the work to distribute itself with some regard to the special capacities and qualifications of the worker, and also that every worker acquires greater skill and rapidity in one kind of work by confining himself to it. The arrangement, therefore, which is deemed indispensable to a just distribution would probably be a very considerable disadvantage in respect of production. But further, it is still a very imperfect standard of justice to demand the same amount of work from every one. People have unequal capacities of work, both mental and bodily, and what is a light task for one is an insupportable burthen to another. It is necessary, therefore, that there should be a dispensing power, an authority competent to grant exemptions from the ordinary amount of work, and to proportion tasks in some measure to capabilities. As long as there are any lazy or selfish persons who like better to be worked for by others than to work, there will be frequent attempts to obtain exemptions by favour or fraud, and the frustration of these attempts will be an affair of considerable difficulty, and will by no means be always successful. These inconveniences would be little felt, for some time at least, in communities composed of select persons, earnestly desirous of the success of the experiment; but plans for

the regeneration of society must consider average human beings, and not only them but the large residuum of persons greatly below the average in the personal and social virtues. The squabbles and ill-blood which could not fail to be engendered by the distribution of work whenever such persons have to be dealt with, would be a great abatement from the harmony and unanimity which Communists hope would be found among the members of their association. That concord would, even in the most fortunate circumstances, be much more liable to disturbance than Communists suppose. The institution provides that there shall be no quarrelling about material interests; individualism is excluded from that department of affairs. But there are other departments from which no institutions can exclude it: there will still be rivalry for reputation and for personal power. When selfish ambition is excluded from the field in which, with most men, it chiefly exercises itself, that of riches and pecuniary interest, it would betake itself with greater intensity to the domain still open to it, and we may expect that the struggles for pre-eminence and for influence in the management would be of great bitterness when the personal passions, diverted from their ordinary channel, are driven to seek their principal gratification in that other direction. For these various reasons it is probable that a Communist association would frequently fail to exhibit the attractive picture of mutual love and unity of will and feeling which we are often told by Communists to expect, but would often be torn by dissension and not unfrequently broken up by it.

Other and numerous sources of discord are inherent in the necessity which the Communist principle involves, of deciding by the general voice questions of the utmost importance to every one, which on the present system can be and are left to individuals to decide, each for his own case. As an example, take the subject of education. All Socialists are strongly impressed with the all-importance of the training given to the young, not only for the reasons which apply universally, but because their demands being much greater than those of any other system upon the intelligence and morality of the individual citizen, they have even more at stake than any other societies on the excellence of their educational arrangements. Now under Communism these arrangements would have to be made for every citizen by the collective body, since individual parents, supposing them to prefer some other mode of educating their children, would have no private means of paying for it, and would be limited to what they could do by their own personal teaching and influence. But every adult member of the body would have an equal voice in determining the collective system designed for the benefit of all. Here, then, is a most fruitful source of discord in every association. All who had any opinion or preference as to the education they

would desire for their own children, would have to rely for their chance of obtaining it upon the influence they could exercise in the joint decision of the community.

It is needless to specify a number of other important questions affecting the mode of employing the productive resources of the association, the conditions of social life, the relations of the body with other associations, &c., on which difference of opinion, often irreconcilable, would be likely to arise. But even the dissensions which might be expected would be a far less evil to the prospects of humanity than a delusive unanimity produced by the prostration of all individual opinions and wishes before the decree of the majority. The obstacles to human progression are always great, and require a concurrence of favourable circumstances to overcome them ; but an indispensable condition of their being overcome is, that human nature should have freedom to expand spontaneously in various directions, both in thought and practice ; that people should both think for themselves and try experiments for themselves, and should not resign into the hands of rulers, whether acting in the name of a few or of the majority, the business of thinking for them, and of prescribing how they shall act. But in Communist associations private life would be brought in a most unexampled degree within the dominion of public authority, and there would be less scope for the development of individual character and individual preferences than has hitherto existed among the full citizens of any state belonging to the progressive branches of the human family. Already in all societies the compression of individuality by the majority is a great and growing evil ; it would probably be much greater under Communism, except so far as it might be in the power of individuals to set bounds to it by selecting to belong to a community of persons like-minded with themselves.

From these various considerations I do not seek to draw any inference against the possibility that Communistic production is capable of being at some future time the form of society best adapted to the wants and circumstances of mankind. I think that this is, and will long be, an open question, upon which fresh light will continually be obtained, both by trial of the Communistic principle under favourable circumstances, and by the improvements which will be gradually effected in the working of the existing system, that of private ownership. The one certainty is, that Communism, to be successful, requires a high standard of both moral and intellectual education in all the members of the community—moral, to qualify them for doing their part honestly and energetically in the labour of life under no inducement but their share in the general interest of the association, and their feelings of duty and sympathy towards it ; intellectual, to make them capable of estimating

distant interests and entering into complex considerations, sufficiently at least to be able to discriminate, in these matters, good counsel from bad. Now I reject altogether the notion that it is impossible for education and cultivation such as is implied in these things to be made the inheritance of every person in the nation; but I am convinced that it is very difficult, and that the passage to it from our present condition can only be slow. I admit the plea that in the points of moral education on which the success of Communism depends, the present state of society is demoralising, and that only a Communistic association can effectually train mankind for Communism. It is for Communism, then, to prove, by practical experiment, its power of giving this training. Experiments alone can show whether there is as yet in any portion of the population a sufficiently high level of moral cultivation to make Communism succeed, and to give to the next generation among themselves the education necessary to keep up that high level permanently. If Communist associations show that they can be durable and prosperous, they will multiply, and will probably be adopted by successive portions of the population of the more advanced countries as they become morally fitted for that mode of life. But to force unprepared populations into Communist societies, even if a political revolution gave the power to make such an attempt, would end in disappointment.

If practical trial is necessary to test the capabilities of Communism, it is no less required for those other forms of Socialism which recognise the difficulties of Communism and contrive means to surmount them. The principal of these is Fourierism, a system which, if only as a specimen of intellectual ingenuity, is highly worthy of the attention of any student, either of society or of the human mind. There is scarcely an objection or a difficulty which Fourier did not foresee, and against which he did not make provision beforehand by self-acting contrivances, grounded, however, upon a less high principle of distributive justice than that of Communism, since he admits inequalities of distribution and individual ownership of capital, but not the arbitrary disposal of it. The great problem which he grapples with is how to make labour attractive, since, if this could be done, the principal difficulty of Socialism would be overcome. He maintains that no kind of useful labour is necessarily or universally repugnant, unless either excessive in amount or devoid of the stimulus of companionship and emulation, or regarded by mankind with contempt. The workers in a Fourierist village are to class themselves spontaneously in groups, each group undertaking a different kind of work, and the same person may be a member not only of one group but of any number; a certain minimum having first been set apart for the subsistence of every

member of the community, whether capable or not of labour, the society divides the remainder of the produce among the different groups, in such shares as it finds attract to each the amount of labour required, and no more; if there is too great a run upon particular groups it is a sign that those groups are over-remunerated relatively to others; if any are neglected their remuneration must be made higher. The share of produce assigned to each group is divided in fixed proportions among three elements—labour, capital, and talent; the part assigned to talent being awarded by the suffrages of the group itself, and it is hoped that among the variety of human capacities all, or nearly all, will be qualified to excel in some group or other. The remuneration for capital is to be such as is found sufficient, to induce savings from individual consumption, in order to increase the common stock to such point as is desired. The number and ingenuity of the contrivances for meeting minor difficulties, and getting rid of minor inconveniences, is very remarkable. By means of these various provisions it is the expectation of Fourierists that the personal inducements to exertion for the public interest, instead of being taken away, would be made much greater than at present, since every increase of the service rendered would be much more certain of leading to increase of reward than it is now, when accidents of position have so much influence. The efficiency of labour, they therefore expect, would be unexampled, while the saving of labour would be prodigious, by diverting to useful occupations that which is now wasted on things useless or hurtful, and by dispensing with the vast number of superfluous distributors, the buying and selling for the whole community being managed by a single agency. The free choice of individuals as to their manner of life would be no further interfered with than would be necessary for gaining the full advantages of co-operation in the industrial operations. Altogether, the picture of a Fourierist community is both attractive in itself and requires less from common humanity than any other known system of Socialism; and it is much to be desired that the scheme should have that fair trial which alone can test the workableness of any new scheme of social life.<sup>1</sup>

The result of our review of the various difficulties of Socialism

(1) The principles of Fourierism are clearly set forth and powerfully defended in the various writings of M. Victor Considérant, especially that entitled *La Destinée Sociale*; but the curious inquirer will do well to study them in the writings of Fourier himself; where he will find unmistakable proofs of genius, mixed, however, with the wildest and most unscientific fancies respecting the physical world, and much interesting but rash speculation on the past and future history of humanity. It is proper to add that on some important social questions, for instance on marriage, Fourier had peculiar opinions, which, however, as he himself declares, are quite independent of, and separable from, the principles of his industrial system.

has led us to the conclusion that the various schemes for managing the productive resources of the country by public instead of private agency have a case for a trial, and some of them may eventually establish their claims to preference over the existing order of things, but that they are at present workable only by the *élite* of mankind, and have yet to prove their power of training mankind at large to the state of improvement which they presuppose. Far more, of course, may this be said of the more ambitious plan which aims at taking possession of the whole land and capital of the country, and beginning at once to administer it on the public account. Apart from all consideration of injustice to the present possessors, the very idea of conducting the whole industry of a country by direction from a single centre is so obviously chimerical, that nobody ventures to propose any mode in which it should be done; and it can hardly be doubted that if the revolutionary Socialists attained their immediate object, and actually had the whole property of the country at their disposal, they would find no other practicable mode of exercising their power over it than that of dividing it into portions, each to be made over to the administration of a small Socialist community. The problem of management, which we have seen to be so difficult even to a select population well prepared beforehand, would be thrown down to be solved as best it could by aggregations united only by locality, or taken indiscriminately from the population, including all the malefactors, all the idlest and most vicious, the most incapable of steady industry, forethought, or self-control, and a majority who, though not equally degraded, are yet, in the opinion of Socialists themselves, as far as regards the qualities essential for the success of Socialism, profoundly demoralised by the existing state of society. It is saying but little to say that the introduction of Socialism under such conditions could have no effect but disastrous failure, and its apostles could have only the consolation that the order of society as it now exists would have perished first, and all who benefit by it would be involved in the common ruin—a consolation which to some of them would probably be real, for if appearances can be trusted the animating principle of too many of the revolutionary Socialists is hate; a very excusable hatred of existing evils, which would vent itself by putting an end to the present system at all costs even to those who suffer by it, in the hope that out of chaos would arise a better Kosmos, and in the impatience of desperation respecting any more gradual improvement. They are unaware that chaos is the very most unfavourable position for setting out in the construction of a Kosmos, and that many ages of conflict, violence, and tyrannical oppression of the weak by the strong must intervene; they know not that they would plunge mankind into the state of nature so forcibly described by Hobbes

(*Leviathan*, Part I. ch. xiii.), where every man is enemy to every man :—

“ In such condition there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain, and consequently no culture of the earth, no navigation, no use of the commodities that may be imported by sea, no commodious building, no instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force, no knowledge of the face of the earth, no account of time, no arts, no letters, no society ; and, which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death ; and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.”

If the poorest and most wretched members of a so-called civilised society are in as bad a condition as every one would be in that worst form of barbarism produced by the dissolution of civilised life, it does not follow that the way to raise them would be to reduce all others to the same miserable state. On the contrary, it is by the aid of the first who have risen that so many others have escaped from the general lot, and it is only by better organization of the same process that it may be hoped in time to succeed in raising the remainder.

#### THE IDEA OF PRIVATE PROPERTY NOT FIXED BUT VARIABLE.

The preceding considerations appear sufficient to show that an entire renovation of the social fabric, such as is contemplated by Socialism, establishing the economic constitution of society upon an entirely new basis, other than that of private property and competition, however valuable as an ideal, and even as a prophecy of ultimate possibilities, is not available as a present resource, since it requires from those who are to carry on the new order of things qualities both moral and intellectual, which require to be tested in all, and to be created in most ; and this cannot be done by an Act of Parliament, but must be, on the most favourable supposition, a work of considerable time. For a long period to come the principle of individual property will be in possession of the field ; and even if in any country a popular movement were to place Socialists at the head of a revolutionary government, in however many ways they might violate private property, the institution itself would survive, and would either be accepted by them or brought back by their expulsion, for the plain reason that people will not lose their hold of what is at present their sole reliance for subsistence and security until a substitute for it has been got into working order. Even those, if any, who had shared among themselves what was the property of others would desire to keep what they had acquired, and to give back to property in the new hands the sacredness which they had not recognised in the old.

But though, for these reasons, individual property has presumably a long term before it, if only of provisional existence, we are not, therefore, to conclude that it must exist during that whole term

unmodified, or that all the rights now regarded as appertaining to property belong to it inherently, and must endure while it endures. On the contrary, it is both the duty and the interest of those who derive the most direct benefit from the laws of property to give impartial consideration to all proposals for rendering those laws in any way less onerous to the majority. This, which would in any case be an obligation of justice, is an injunction of prudence also, in order to place themselves in the right against the attempts which are sure to be frequent to bring the Socialist forms of society prematurely into operation.

One of the mistakes oftenest committed, and which are the sources of the greatest practical errors in human affairs, is that of supposing that the same name always stands for the same aggregation of ideas. No word has been the subject of more of this kind of misunderstanding than the word property. It denotes in every state of society the largest powers of exclusive use or exclusive control over things (and sometimes, unfortunately, over persons) which the law accords, or which custom, in that state of society, recognises; but these powers of exclusive use and control are very various, and differ greatly in different countries and in different states of society.

For instance, in early states of society, the right of property did not include the right of bequest. The power of disposing of property by will was in most countries of Europe a rather late institution; and long after it was introduced it continued to be limited in favour of what were called natural heirs. Where bequest is not permitted, individual property is only a life interest. And in fact, as has been so well and fully set forth by Sir Henry Maine in his most instructive work on Ancient Law, the primitive idea of property was that it belonged to the family, not the individual. The head of the family had the management and was the person who really exercised the proprietary rights. As in other respects, so in this, he governed the family with nearly despotic power. But he was not free so to exercise his power as to defeat the co-proprietors of the other portions; he could not so dispose of the property as to deprive them of the joint enjoyment or of the succession. By the laws and customs of some nations the property could not be alienated without the consent of the male children; in other cases the child could by law demand a division of the property and the assignment to him of his share, as in the story of the Prodigal Son. If the association kept together after the death of the head, some other member of it, not always his son, but often the eldest of the family, the strongest, or the one selected by the rest, succeeded to the management and to the managing rights, all the others retaining theirs as before. If, on the other hand, the body broke up into separate families, each of these took away with it a part of the property. I say the property,



not the inheritance, because the process was a mere continuance of existing rights, not a creation of new; the manager's share alone lapsed to the association.

Then, again, in regard to proprietary rights over immovables (the principal kind of property in a rude age) these rights were of very varying extent and duration. By the Jewish law property in immovables was only a temporary concession; on the Sabbatical year it returned to the common stock to be redistributed; though we may surmise that in the historical times of the Jewish state this rule may have been successfully evaded. In many countries of Asia, before European ideas intervened, nothing existed to which the expression property in land, as we understand the phrase, is strictly applicable. The ownership was broken up among several distinct parties, whose rights were determined rather by custom than by law. The government was part owner, having the right to a heavy rent. Ancient ideas and even ancient laws limited the government share to some particular fraction of the gross produce, but practically there was no fixed limit. The government might make over its share to an individual, who then became possessed of the right of collection and all the other rights of the state, but not those of any private person connected with the soil. These private rights were of various kinds. The actual cultivators, or such of them as had been long settled on the land, had a right to retain possession; it was held unlawful to evict them while they paid the rent—a rent not in general fixed by agreement, but by the custom of the neighbourhood. Between the actual cultivators and the state, or the substitute to whom the state had transferred its rights, there were intermediate persons with rights of various extent. There were officers of government who collected the state's share of the produce, sometimes for large districts, who, though bound to pay over to government all they collected, after deducting a percentage, were often hereditary officers. There were also, in many cases, village communities, consisting of the reputed descendants of the first settlers of a village, who shared among themselves either the land or its produce according to rules established by custom, either cultivating it themselves or employing others to cultivate it for them, and whose rights in the land approached nearer to those of a landed proprietor, as understood in England, than those of any other party concerned. But the proprietary right of the village was not individual, but collective; inalienable (the rights of individual sharers could only be sold or mortgaged with the consent of the community) and governed by fixed rules. In mediæval Europe almost all land was held from the sovereign on tenure of service, either military or agricultural; and in Great Britain even now, when the services as well as all the reserved rights of the sovereign have long since fallen into disuse or

been commuted for taxation, the theory of the law does not acknowledge an absolute right of property in land in any individual; the fullest landed proprietor known to the law, the freeholder, is but a "tenant" of the Crown. In Russia, even when the cultivators of the soil were serfs of the landed proprietor, his proprietary right in the land was limited by rights of theirs belonging to them as a collective body managing its own affairs, and with which he could not interfere. And in most of the countries of continental Europe when serfage was abolished or went out of use, those who had cultivated the land as serfs remained in possession of rights as well as subject to obligations. The great land reforms of Stein and his successors in Prussia consisted in abolishing both the rights and the obligations, and dividing the land bodily between the proprietor and the peasant, instead of leaving each of them with a limited right over the whole. In other cases, as in Tuscany, the *metayer* farmer is virtually co-proprietor with the landlord, since custom, though not law, guarantees to him a permanent possession and half the gross produce, so long as he fulfils the customary conditions of his tenure.

Again, if rights of property over the same things are of different extent in different countries, so also are they exercised over different things. In all countries at a former time, and in some countries still, the right of property extended and extends to the ownership of human beings. There has often been property in public trusts, as in judicial offices, and a vast multitude of others in France before the Revolution; there are still a few patent offices in Great Britain, though I believe they will cease by operation of law on the death of the present holders; and we are only now abolishing property in army rank. Public bodies, constituted and endowed for public purposes, still claim the same inviolable right of property in their estates which individuals have in theirs, and though a sound political morality does not acknowledge this claim, the law supports it. We thus see that the right of property is differently interpreted, and held to be of different extent, in different times and places; that the conception entertained of it is a varying conception, has been frequently revised, and may admit of still further revision. It is also to be noticed that the revisions which it has hitherto undergone in the progress of society have generally been improvements. When, therefore, it is maintained, rightly or wrongly, that some change or modification in the powers exercised over things by the persons legally recognised as their proprietors would be beneficial to the public and conducive to the general improvement, it is no good answer to this merely to say that the proposed change conflicts with the idea of property. The idea of property is not some one thing, identical throughout history and incapable of alteration, but is variable like all other creations of the human mind; at any given time

it is a brief expression denoting the rights over things conferred by the law or custom of some given society at that time; but neither on this point nor on any other has the law and custom of a given time and place a claim to be stereotyped for ever. A proposed reform in laws or customs is not necessarily objectionable because its adoption would imply, not the adaptation of all human affairs to the existing idea of property, but the adaptation of existing ideas of property to the growth and improvement of human affairs. This is said without prejudice to the equitable claim of proprietors to be compensated by the state for such legal rights of a proprietary nature as they may be dispossessed of for the public advantage. That equitable claim, the grounds and the just limits of it, are a subject by itself, and as such will be discussed hereafter. Under this condition, however, society is fully entitled to abrogate or alter any particular right of property which on sufficient consideration it judges to stand in the way of the public good. And assuredly the terrible case which, as we saw in a former chapter, Socialists are able to make out against the present economic order of society, demands a full consideration of all means by which the institution may have a chance of being made to work in a manner more beneficial to that large portion of society which at present enjoys the least share of its direct benefits.

THE END.

## ITALIAN POLITICS.

WHEN I first arrived in Italy, last November, I found politicians in that country anxious, troubled about the future, and fearful of some ill-defined catastrophe. The country was beyond all doubt in a state of agitation and disturbance, and in every direction societies of revolutionary character were multiplying. Passanante's attempt took place shortly afterwards, and Orsini bombs were thrown in the streets of Florence and Pisa. Both of these acts were crimes not only odious, but aimless and unreasonable, and thus betrayed a great though concealed fermentation of anti-social hatred. The unanimous and enthusiastic outburst of affection towards the King, which excited the whole of Italy when it was known that his life had been threatened, cleared the air and dissipated the general apprehension. Nevertheless universal freedom from panic is far from prevailing, even at the present moment.

There are black spots, no doubt, in the future of Italy, as in that of all European countries. But still it does not appear to me that she is threatened with any immediate danger. Let us look first at her foreign relations. Peninsula as she is, her frontiers are so clearly marked by the Alps, on the side where she touches the Continent, that she enjoys something not unlike the advantages of a wholly insular position. Not one of her neighbours now entertains the idea of depriving her of the smallest strip of territory. Neither France nor Austria has any wish to cross the hills for the purpose of conquering what could not be kept except at an immense sacrifice and at the price of continually threatening danger. The achievement of a united and strong Italy is a pledge of peace to the whole south of Europe. As long as she was divided between several States, all of which were weak and in perpetual quest of foreign support, there was an inducement for other powers to engage in struggles for the privilege of interference. This danger has now disappeared; but there remains, it is true, the question of the temporal power, which is a source of alarm to the Italians when they think of the possibility either of a monarchical restoration in France or of the uprising of a theocratic movement throughout Europe. But even in such a case there are certain circumstances which would secure Italy from attack. In the first place, the anti-Papal or non-Catholic powers of Germany, Russia, and England are not exactly those which are of least weight in Europe, and it is not likely that they would leave Italy in the lurch. In the second place, a restored monarchy in France, in whatever manner it might come into being would have so

much to fear from the resistance of the vanquished parties, that it would not be in a condition to undertake foreign war against a friendly nation possessing not merely means of defence but also the general sympathy of Europe. An ecclesiastical State, having for its head a prelate chosen for the purpose of directing souls, is obviously a thing of the past which no longer possesses the conditions necessary to actual existence. There were many such States formerly in Europe, but all have successively disappeared. The same historic law has been everywhere fatal to the temporal power; and no institution against which all the influences of the time are arrayed has any chance of revival. The idea of effecting a temporary restoration of the dominion of the Pope-king by force of arms is an idle dream. Such a restoration would instantly collapse again. Henri V. himself would perceive this, and would refuse to attempt the impossible.

There is therefore no chance of an attack upon Italy from without. But may she not herself molest her neighbours? May not the *Italia Irredenta* agitation constitute a danger? I do not think so. These demonstrations have not been in any way really serious. They were organized by a few individual hotheads, and by a small number of democratic societies. The bulk of the population was either indifferent to them, or decidedly hostile. The claims themselves are indeed too ridiculous. *Italia Irredenta* consists of Nice, Corsica, the Ticino, the Trentino, Trieste, Dalmatia, and perhaps Malta as well. Italian soil has therefore to be reclaimed from France, Switzerland, Austria, and England. Italians are too sensible not to comprehend the real absurdity of this factitious movement. The northern shore of Lake Garda alone may possibly some day or other come back to Italy, and such a rectification of frontier as this is not likely to cause much excitement to anybody. There is therefore no ground of quarrel or difference with other States. Far different from this situation is the case of France, which bears in her side the still bleeding wound of Alsace,—of Germany, which, as Prince Bismarck recently remarked, has to distrust all her neighbours,—of Austria, which is constantly menaced by accidents which would destroy her very existence,—of Russia, deeply engaged in all the entanglements of the Eastern Question,—of England, who, besides her little wars in Asia and Africa, holds herself bound to defend India in the Mediterranean and in Asia Minor. Italy, moreover, has this advantage, that she has no distant colonies to protect, the defence of which requires a great navy, and frequently, as England and Spain know, a heavy expenditure. She might, therefore, without danger greatly reduce her war expenses, and especially the expenses of her fleet.

As for home affairs, Italy possesses a Constitution which is so

administered as to make her one of the freest countries of the continent. No expression of human activity is fettered in Italy. She has liberty of worship, liberty of instruction, liberty of public meeting, and even of association; in short, the full freedom of England or of Belgium. If complaints are made on this score, it is that liberty is too unrestrained. The young King has taken his father for model, and is a pattern constitutional monarch. He is anxious to conform in all points to the wishes of the nation; he accepts with a perfectly good grace the ministries which the votes of Parliament designate; he is entirely devoted to the welfare of the country; he favours and encourages everything which tends to progress. Quite recently he has founded splendid prizes for the encouragement of literature and science. It may be safely said that he has not an enemy even among the Republican party. Passanante, the regicide, himself allowed that he was animated by no sort of personal dislike to the King. Queen Margaret is sensible, cultivated, kindly, earnest, and personally charming to all who come near her. She is the object of something like real worship, and on her last birthday everybody wore daisies in her honour at his buttonhole. There could not be a more popular dynasty. All Italians know that to Victor Emmanuel the making of Italy is due, so that patriotism and attachment to the House of Savoy are identified. The unity of the country is not, as was once feared, endangered by the old enmities of the different districts. Identity of race, language, religion, and traditions has brought about a fusion which has made one nation of the old States more easily and quickly than could possibly have been foreseen. In no European country, not even in England, France, or Spain, are parties more at one in this respect. The differences between French Flanders and Provence are extremely great; Galicia and the Basque Provinces are ethnologically distinct from Andalusia; England includes, besides the Englishman, the Irishman, the Welshman, and the Scot. But in Italy, despite minor shades of difference, there are none but Italians.

What, then, are the dark spots which loom in the future? They are generally said to be three in number—Socialism, Clericalism, and Republican sects. Let us see what dangers are in reality threatened by these. Socialist tendencies exist in Italy, no less than in other civilised countries, as a result and, so to say, a necessary result of prevailing economic conditions. The working classes receiving in return for their labour only a scant wage, reduced still further and sometimes swept away by industrial and commercial crises, ideas of equality and of a repartition of profits naturally spread. Workmen hope to better their lot by altering the laws affecting the distribution of property, and the organization of

society; and this is what Socialism means when reduced to its simplest terms. It is a result of the contrast between the equality professed in theory, and the inequality existing in fact. But if the existence of Socialism is at the present day universal, the forms under which it presents itself are different in different countries. In Russia it pervades all classes of society and ends in Nihilism; that is to say it wishes to destroy utterly the despotism which weighs on every part of that huge empire. In Germany Socialism is scientific and political; it is represented by a powerful party, which has doctrines, manuals, orators, associations, a press, a staff, a propaganda; it is by the road of popular election that it hopes some day to prevail in Parliament and in all representative bodies. In England and in America its efforts have been concentrated upon the wages question. It is by association, by the trades union system, and by strikes that the workmen there strive to obtain an augmented share of profit for their labour.

In Italy Socialism has an entirely different character. It exists actively in the "sects," and in some of the towns; in a dormant condition in the country districts. The sects—secret societies which are a legacy of the past—are still among the scourges of Italy, especially in the Romagna and in the south. The ramifications of these societies spread in every direction, and draw recruits from all classes of society. Under the name of Republican Societies and *Circoli Barsanti* they have recently come into public notice. The name of these clubs was taken from a corporal who, in a trifling military disturbance at Pavia, killed an officer, and was shot in consequence. It was maintained that Barsanti was innocent, and the object of the societies in borrowing his name was to attract the non-commissioned officers and to inflame them against their superiors. It is even said that they have many members in the army, and that this is one of the dangers of the future. All these societies are more or less imbued with Socialist ideas. But their Socialism is not of the scientific kind as in Germany, but consists merely of dreams of revolution and levelling. In the country, where large properties are the rule, Socialist ideas are as naturally born of the extreme misery of the rural population, as was the mediæval Jacquerie. The daily wage never exceeds a franc, and yet living has become nearly as dear in Italy as in Northern Europe. Even this scanty income cannot always be procured. In an excellent book Messrs. Franchetti and Sydney Sonnino have drawn a picture of the condition of the country classes, which is said to be photographically accurate, and which may well make one shudder. Aspirations after equality also make their way into the country by means of soldiers, who have returned home and who have caught them up in the cafés of the towns. Ideas spread much more quickly in the south than in the north; the mind

is more open, the tongue more lively. In former days religion kept down the exasperation of the disinherited classes; it taught resignation to present evils, and as a compensation it opened the prospect of eternal happiness in a better world. But now the religious sentiment is singularly deadened, and enmity towards the priest often replaces the ancient confidence. I have also been informed in various quarters that the lower country clergy, who are nearly as poor as the workmen themselves, are inclining to Socialism. This was recently affirmed in the *Giornale degli Economisti* by Signor G. Boccardo, a distinguished economist, and the assertion is confirmed by a curious fact. In April, 1877, a band of young men, members of secret societies, met at the village of San Lupo, to the eastward of Capua, to prepare a revolutionary movement. A struggle took place with the carbineers who were ordered to keep an eye upon them, and two of these carbineers were killed. The band took possession of the village of Letino, it proclaimed itself the apostle of social revolution, and burnt the register of title-deeds at the foot of a crucifix in the village square. The parish priest then mounted the base of the crucifix and delivered an inflammatory speech, which he ended by saying that the men who had come to establish equality were the true apostles of the Lord, whose laws they wished to put in force. The band then set out for the neighbouring village of Gallo. The incumbent of this parish came out to meet them, and, after embracing the leader, returned joyfully to the village, and told the inhabitants to fear nothing. "They are good fellows," said he, "who will change the government and burn the registers." "*Cambiamento di governo ed incendio di carte.*" Soon the whole band fell into the hands of the troops. They were brought up for trial in the Assize Court at Capua. Their counsel declared that the charge was a political one, and that, in consequence, notwithstanding the death of the two carbineers, it was covered by the amnesty proclaimed at the young King's accession; whereupon the jury acquitted them. The whole thing reads like a chapter in a novel; but the important point as a symptom is, that the priests of the two villages occupied greeted the band enthusiastically, and hailed the social revolution as a deliverance.

In the northern towns where manufactures exist, the prefects assured me that many workmen, even without being members of secret societies, incline to ideas of levelling and of social reorganization. It may therefore be said that Socialism is at this moment spreading in Italy among the industrial classes, among the country labourers in those provinces where their condition is worst, and also among the lower clergy, who are but little removed from beggary. But I do not think that this as yet constitutes a real danger for the existing order of things. Happily for Italy she has no great



industrial centres, where workmen live huddled together in factories, and exposed to the ruinous misfortune of lowered wages and enforced idleness. Disturbances and even open insurrections in the country cannot extend beyond certain localities, nor can they threaten the great centres. The action of the clergy could only be dangerous if the heads of the Church were to enter into the Socialist movement, and they have not yet reached this point. Otherwise the peril would only become great if the contagion of the ideas of social revolution were to penetrate into the army through the non-commissioned officers, who in the cafés are in constant contact with the members of the sects. But though I have heard much said on this subject, it seems to me that the danger is still at a distance. The two chief pillars of social order are the priest and the soldier; and if both were some day to go over to the enemy, a general upset would be inevitable. I should not like to say that this day will never come, but I think that it has not come yet.

There are some Italians who think that if the Republic were to establish itself definitively in France, the example might affect the maintenance of monarchical institutions in Italy. Without doubt, what is going on in France will always exercise a real influence on the two neighbouring countries of the same race, Italy and Spain. But I doubt whether this influence can be of sufficient power to threaten the dynasty of Savoy. In the first place, the main attention of everybody is, nowadays, directed to economic and social questions, and men have become indifferent to all that concerns merely political arrangements. The course of events is responsible for this change in ideas; it is but lately that the Republic was for one party an object of violent repulsion and irrepressible fear, for others of youthful enthusiasm and unlimited hopes. The Republic has been established in two great countries—in the United States for a century, for a decade in France—without justifying either hopes or fears. It has not brought the Eldorado which one side hoped for, nor the general massacre which the other side feared. Civilisation keeps the same course and goes through the same trials in the United States as in England, in France as in Germany. The same economic and religious problems, the same financial crises, the same class enmities, the same struggle between capital and labour, are met with in all civilised countries, whether their constitution be republican or monarchic. The Italians have seen that constitutional monarchy can give to a nation order and liberty both, in the most complete manner possible. In this respect Italy has no reason to envy France. Although in the latter country the defenders of the Republic have shown the height of wisdom and prudence, it will be long before the new institutions will give the feeling of security and confidence which a system of government that has finally taken root is wont to

inspire. Besides, as M. Minghetti recently put it at a dinner given to him by the undergraduates of Bologna, and as I have myself endeavoured to prove in my book on *The Forms of Government*, monarchy with a representative system is a better guarantee of freedom than a republic, because it keeps intact the rights of minorities, a matter of the first importance in every society where the people is master. Even from the point of view of social reform, it does not appear that the Republic presents any decided advantage over constitutional monarchy; for the sovereign, as has been often proved, has a natural tendency to occupy himself with the lower classes, a tendency far less likely to be felt by a majority animated by the usually selfish sentiments of a dominant class. Add to these general considerations the great and widespread popularity enjoyed by the House of Savoy, to which Italy owes its existence as a nation, and it will be easily seen why the Republican party is so weak in Italy. Yet it has enjoyed a complete liberty of proselytism, and what is more, the historical traditions of the great towns, such as Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Bologna, Florence, are before all things republican. In Parliament the Republican group has but eighteen members, and its head, Dr. Bertani, has even committed himself to the acceptance of existing institutions with reservation of his theoretical preferences. The *Dovere*, the chief organ of the Mazzinian party in Rome, has just announced its own dissolution for want of subscribers, though Italian journals are usually cheap enough. At Naples, in the busy University, which has more than 3,000 students, I asked the students themselves whether there were many Republicans among them. I was answered that there were hardly any, but that all were anti-clerical, and that a considerable number were of Socialist and materialist leanings. Everybody knows that the proclamation of the Republic would destroy unity. The north would remain faithful to the house of Savoy, which, thus possessing a citadel and base at the foot of the Alps, would either reduce the insurrection, or would hand over the south to the restoration and to anarchy. Italy will never again be partitioned. The only question which demands an answer is this: Will its preservation, like its first founding, be effected freely, or by the use of armed force?

There remains the third point—Clericalism. This is a real danger to Italy, because it has for its definite object the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, and consequently the destruction of the kingdom as it now exists. In the second place, because, even short of this, if it should succeed in mustering strongly in the communal and provincial councils or in Parliament, it might, by an alliance with the Radicals, create entanglements indefinitely, and thus make capital out of the popular discontent. At the present

moment there is not in the Chamber a single deputy avowedly of the Clerical party. The word has been passed to all the partisans of the Pope to hold aloof, and neither to be electors nor elected. For the moment, too, the great majority of Italians, even the most conservative of them, being anxious to preserve the unity of Italy, a party whose object, open or concealed, is the partition of the country has no chance of success. It is for this reason that Father Curci advises the Pope and the Catholics to change their tactics. Keep untouched, he says, the rights of the Holy See on which you can listen to no compromise, but do not make them a burning political question. Stand forth simply as a conservative party. You represent the religious sentiment with which no society can dispense. You are thus an essential ingredient, and even the foundation-stone of social order—the only bulwark against the assaults of the atheistic and revolutionary spirit. Sooner or later, when the danger is clearly seen, all conservative forces and partisans will array themselves on your side, and you will recover your rightful influence and authority. The Pope is said to listen not unwillingly to Father Curci; it is certain that, after being proscribed by Pius IX., the father has been summoned to the Vatican by Leo XIII., who has no wish to continue the visionary policy of his predecessor, and is anxious to be reconciled to other governments. In his sketch of the dangers of Socialism, the Pope has pointed out that the only remedy is an alliance between the throne and the altar. He is not blind to the true interests of the clergy. By effecting a reconciliation with the civil power, the Church would be free to pursue her work of proselytism, and a few concessions are nothing to the conquests which the clergy could make if they were not checked by the Government. Leo XIII. was for a long time nuncio at Brussels. There he saw the great profit that the Church can derive from modern free institutions if she learns how to make good use of them; and it would appear that it is in this direction that he would direct the advance of the clerical army all over the world. To gain the control of modern civilisation by the methods of modern liberty, and thus to realise the Hildebrandine dream of the universal supremacy of the Church—not by anathemas and papal fulminations, but by the hustings, the parliaments, the right of association, and the press—this is his plan.

In order to gain this end in Italy everything has yet to be done. In the first place the superior clergy, which is completely devoted to the Pope, is as yet inexperienced in political warfare, and does not possess the indispensable equipment for action. The inferior clergy is in part animated by a certain feeling of patriotism towards Italy, and with few exceptions has no militant desires. The country priest draws his income, not from a State allowance, but from a small

glebe which he often cultivates himself, and sometimes lets. He is thus tied to the soil and filled with considerations of worldly interest. He wishes to sell his corn, his oil, or his wine, and in order that he may get a good price for it, the country must be prosperous and tranquil. He is connected with civil society, not indeed by marriage, which would be better still, but at any rate through the medium of the land. By the fireside at evening, or in the watches of the night, his thoughts are certainly not occupied with dreams of the greatness of the Church, and of her struggle with modern ideas. He thinks of manuring his land, of pruning his trees. His life and his ways of thinking are identical with those of his brother farmers, from whom he is only distinguished by a thin varnish of seminary education. He goes to market, and his talk is of bullocks like his neighbours'. Thus he has nowise the appearance to them of a superior being representing the universal Church. He has not the prestige or the authority which the priest possesses in France or in Belgium. He is listened to readily enough as a counsellor somewhat better educated than others, but if he were to take the high tone and lay down the law, there would be a stout resistance to the pretension. The country priest is poor, humble, and timid, often very ignorant, frequently coarse enough, and in the south at least of very easy morals. He has, therefore, none of the style of a missionary, nor has he the notions of a soldier of the papacy. He lives a prosaic life destitute of ideal. He might have real power as an organ of popular excitement which he could inflame; but if he endeavoured to go against the tendencies of his parishioners, he would not be obeyed. The priest becomes a power in elections when he can say to his flock, "You shall vote for so and so, or I will not absolve you." But in Italy he would not think of taking such a step, nor does he even dare to forbid the reading of anti-clerical journals. If the Liberals pass a bill (which has been already brought in) to substitute a regular stipend for the glebes of the clergy, they will untie the bond which binds the lower clergy to civil society, and will make of them simply a papal militia. This would be the first step. The second would be for the bishops to take the seminaries in hand, to drill their Levites for political strife, and especially to make them understand that by influencing the elections they can become the masters of those whom they now fear. This is beginning already to be done, and some young priests have glimpses of an ideal authority which they may one day enjoy. But before they can attain to this, it will be necessary for them, in their turn, to form the younger generation, to drill them to submission, and to accustom the laity, little by little, to admit their influence. This work of preparation will take a long time. I think, indeed, that a clerical party will before long be regularly constituted in Italy, and that the clergy, better disciplined

by the bishops, will regain in great measure its lost influence; but it will take at least two generations before this party can secure an actual majority in Parliament. Italy, therefore, is in no immediate danger from Clericalism any more than from Socialism or from the Republican party.

She is, however, actually suffering from a serious and remarkable disorder which hinders her progress, and which disturbs her friends. An ex-minister, the eminent economist and publicist, Signor Jocini, said to me not long ago, "Our situation looks well, both at home and abroad, and yet there is some appearance of our being doomed to perish of senile gangrene. Our political disease is the absence of parties. Elsewhere, the complaint is that party feeling runs too high. In Italy, on the other hand, we have mere groups with no watchword, with no plan, with no bond of internal union." If you go to a sitting of the Chamber, you will be told that the Centre counts one hundred and ten members, and the Left four hundred. They will tell you, too, that there is even a Left Centre, and an Extreme Left. They will show you the Cairoli group, most numerous of all, the Crispi group, the Nicotera group, the Depretis group. But these names only designate the places where certain members usually sit, or, at most, certain vague ties of alliance and comradeship. Ask what the distinguishing tenets of these groups are, and nobody will be able to give you an answer; even between Right and Left there is no real difference of opinion. The true right, which would here, as in most other countries, consist of Catholics, that is to say, the Clerical party, is absent, and thus it happens that all the members are at once disciples of Conservatism and of progress. They are Conservative, inasmuch as, except the eighteen Republicans, all desire the maintenance of existing institutions; they are Progressists, because they are all disposed to advance. Of reactionaries, of partisans of the past, there is not a single one. In any other country the two chiefs of the right, Signors Minghetti and Sella, would rank among the Radical section of the Left. Signor Minghetti, for example, who is a partisan of absolute separation of Church and State, would not hesitate to propose the abolition of the vote for religion, a measure at which M. Gambetta himself hesitates. Signor Sella has proposed and voted for the most anti-clerical measures, such even as the imposition of liability to military service upon seminarists. Among the Left, on the other hand, there is to be found a considerable number of members, chiefly Southern, whose election has received the support of the clergy. As for the extension of the franchise, there are several members of the Right who would push it as far as universal suffrage, because they think that the peasants would exercise the right better than the lower townsfolk, who now possess it and who

pay 40 lire—32 shillings—in taxes. All the good patriots have been revolutionists, and among those statesmen who have in turn held office, the majority have been outlawed, exiled, or even sentenced to death. At the Capitol in the Conservative lobby the bust of Mazzini, crowned with laurel, is to be seen. Among the Italian nobility no section is to be found possessing the least resemblance to the Legitimists of France or the Feudalists of Germany. Almost all those of noble birth are imbued with modern ideas, and bear some likeness to English Whigs, or to the philosophic nobles of the eighteenth century.

It is therefore impossible to mention a single question of the first importance which might be used as a party shibboleth. We cannot go further than to say that there exist two opposing tendencies. The Left has more confidence in the people, and is therefore more disposed to adopt what are called democratic measures. Its members are doctrinaires, in the sense of believing in general propositions and abstract principles, and of drawing inspiration from the example of the French Revolution. The Right busies itself rather with the question how the government is to be carried on. It thinks that a form of rule may be suitable to America and yet prejudicial to Italy, and it frequently quotes the example of the English, whose practical spirit it extols. The Left would willingly cry "All for the people and by the people;" the Right "All for the people, but not by them." In order that a country may possess homogeneous parties capable of working the machinery of parliamentary government, there must be a sharp difference of opinion on some subject of importance interesting to the whole nation, and dominating points of merely secondary weight. This difference must excite the public and divide it into two opposing camps, each with its fixed programme, its avowed object, its acknowledged chiefs. There is nothing of this sort in Italy. Elections are for the most part decided on personal grounds, and the candidate who enlists most local sympathy carries the day. The indifference of the electors is so great, that sometimes more than half of them—there are about half a million—abstain from voting. Now the evil consequences of the absence of parties are these. In the first place there is the instability of governments. "An interpellation, a ministerial crisis, a temporary arrangement, and then another temporary arrangement, a ministerial crisis, and an interpellation," such are the terms in which the ordinary course of parliamentary government in Italy has been described. All ministries are extremely short-lived, and even their short life is interrupted by resignations, translations, and reconstitutions. In the eighteen years which form the life of the new kingdom of Italy, there have been twenty-five ministerial crises. In England, where parliamentary government works in a typical manner, the result of the elections

determines the majority, and the majority places in office the men who best represent the ideas of the triumphant party. As long as the majority is not reduced to a minority, the ministers who will remain at the head of affairs, and the general programme to be pursued, can be safely predicted. A party can only take office by means of the majority, and can only lose it when the majority turns against it, either in Parliament or in the constituencies. Government by parties and by the majority is the only one which can give strength and efficiency to parliamentary institutions. But in Italy it is different. Unforeseen ministerial crises are constantly occurring. They come from personal susceptibilities, from the exigencies of a group which is dissatisfied and estranged, from many small causes which have nothing to do with the open conflict of debate and the actual strength of opinions in the Chamber. It thus becomes impossible to prophesy the duration of a ministry, except that it will in any case be short. Parliament presents a kind of dissolving view of processions of men with portfolios having their exits and their entrances, of ministries raised and pulled down by the fluctuating support or the fluctuating hostility of certain coalitions, composed in their turn of smaller coteries which are themselves in a constant state of flux. Suppose the question is to form a government. Its members will not be pointed out, and, so to speak, imperatively pointed out, as in England, by the division which has brought about the fall of the preceding Cabinet. One person will be chosen because he has the support of a necessary group; another because he will bring with him the Sicilians or the Venetians; a third because he represents some interest of which account has to be taken. Such combinations, even if they brought together men of the first rank, could never produce a strong government, because there could be between them neither unity of views nor identity of origin. The least accident is sufficient to bring their differences to light, to prove their incompatibility, and to precipitate a crisis. Ministers even of moderate ability, if they have the support of a compact majority, can govern in a regular and consequent manner; but Richelieu, Colbert, Pitt, or Peel would be helpless if they had to busy themselves with the claims of this man, and to soothe the ill-temper of that, and if they had to prolong their constantly menaced existence by a series of negotiations, compromises, and bargains. There results, therefore, from the want of parties, an incurable want of strength in governments. Ministers have no time to familiarise themselves with the details of their departments, or to impress a definite line of conduct on their subordinates. From this arises administrative indolence and disorder. A minister who has taken office in consequence of the victory of a clearly held opinion or a definite programme can insist upon his followers sinking minor differences,

can keep up discipline in the name of the interest of the party, can give effect to his designs, and thus can govern with as much thoroughness as the ministers of absolute power. The members who have pledged themselves to their constituents, and who fear to create a schism in the party, cannot make themselves the instruments of their private ambitions or of merely local interests. If they deserted their chiefs, they would be looked upon as traitors and would altogether lose caste. In Italy, there being no accepted plan and no party discipline, the members can vote as they like on each particular question which presents itself in Parliament. The ministry has therefore to organize its majority on each occasion by satisfying individual claims. The result can only be feebleness and impotence. It cannot be said that men of distinction are wanting in the Italian Parliament, for there are many such of all kinds, as the high tone of the debates and the display of tactical skill has shown. If anything there are too many men of eminence. Each individual of distinction or influence having the control of a group of adherents, it follows that the abundance of leaders involves an equal abundance of small corps d'armée, which manœuvre independently and which are all the more difficult to combine. The frequent changes of ministry have resulted in this, that some seventy or eighty ex-ministers have seats in the chamber. These are as it were so many dethroned dynasties, with their representative pretenders, who have all to be reckoned with. From the absence of discipline it follows that free-lances abound. Incidents and interpellations are constantly interrupting the dispatch of business, and the sessions are interminable; they last for eight or nine months, and the longer they are, the more sterile they seem to be. There is much talking and little doing. The time of the ministers is completely taken up by interpellations which it is necessary to answer, and by the immense work necessary in the lobbies to make up a majority, which is always on the point of melting away.

In short, the most obvious evil from which Italy is suffering is, that the absence of parties weakens the hands of government and renders the parliamentary system unstable. An Italian deputy recently said to me, "Is it not humiliating for our time that such a machine as this, which is always falling out of gear or getting clogged, should be the best form of government yet invented?" What, then, is the cure for this evil? The only effectual one would be that which Prince Bismarck proposed at one of those teas of which Dr. Busch has given us the table-talk, namely, to condemn to bread-and-water every member who opened his lips without due cause. Better still would it be to cut down the length of the sessions to a single month. If the malaria could drive the deputies away from Rome during eleven months of the year, it would be a



great thing for Italy. Signor Jocini thinks that if the kingdom were divided into provinces, with councils possessed of considerable powers, the central Parliament would be lightened and would be better able to do its work. I think so too, but there might be a danger that these provinces would lead to the revival of the ancient States. Others are of opinion that the remedy is to be found in a large extension of the franchise. But in this case enemies of the existing order might be elected—ultra-democrats in the towns, clericals in the country. The wisest heads, however, seem to think that the formation of a true Clerical party in Parliament would give cohesion to the Liberal factions, and would create the indispensable opposition of two great opinions which the mechanism of Parliament demands. This would be the ballast necessary to steady the ship. Nor is there any doubt that this advantage would be gained; but might not the Clerical party, uniting as it necessarily would all other Conservative elements, one day become master?

Notwithstanding the fault of its Parliamentary system, the progress effected in Italy during the last twenty years is certainly extraordinary. Since the creation of the new kingdom the Government has always been in the hands of the Right until the 18th March, 1876, except during the two Rattazzi ministries of 1862 and 1868, the first of which ended at Aspromonte, the second at Mentana. The Right fell from power at the very moment when Signor Minghetti was bringing in the famous *Pareggio*, the budget without a deficit which had been so long desired. Strange to say, the occasion of the party's fall was its advocacy of the resumption of the railways by the State, a Radical measure of an almost Socialist tendency. The Left, on the other hand, achieved its triumph by adopting a principle generally considered Conservative. Meanwhile the financial progress has been almost incredible. In 1862 the expenditure was 921 millions of lire, and the income 471 millions, the deficit being 450 millions, or nearly one-half. A more desperate financial situation has, perhaps, never been witnessed. In 1876 equilibrium was attained, expenditure and income each amounting to 1,398 millions. But in order to reach this result it has been necessary to have recourse to crushing taxation; taxation in some cases odious also, as in the case of the *Macinato*, or grist tax. The taxes on personalty amount to more than 13 per cent. of the income; the various duties on real property to 30 and sometimes 40 per cent of the rent. These weighty imposts the Italian people has borne in order to meet its engagements. But it has taken vengeance in 1876 by driving from power the party which inflicted them upon it. Notwithstanding paper currency, increased debts, and heavy taxes, the general economic progress of the country is undeniable. Here are some figures showing the contrasts between 1862

and 1876. It is necessary, however, to allow for the annexation of Venetia, with a population amounting to about a tenth of the whole. This latter was in 1862, 22,929,000, and in 1876, 27,769,000. In fourteen years the State has spent two and a half milliards in public works. The army and the navy have been reorganized, and supplied with fresh *matériel* of a very perfect and therefore a very costly kind. The troops, both officers and soldiers, work very hard, and the evidence of this is to be found in the precision of their drill, the smartness of their appearance, and their general air of intelligence and enlightenment. The annual value of exports and imports has risen from 1,600 millions to 2,300; the tonnage returns of the ports from 14 to 24 millions; the sums discounted by the banks of issue from 1,600 to 2,300 millions of lire; the revenue of the post-office from 12 millions to 24; that of the telegraphs from 2½ millions to 5½; the deposits in the savings-banks—an excellent sign—from 188 to 553 millions. The mileage of the railways has increased from 2,200 kilometres to 7,850, and their receipts from 50 to 152 millions. At the same time education is spreading. The number of children at school has risen from 1,109,000 to 1,931,000, and new buildings for the purpose are being constructed everywhere. In the higher regions of intellectual culture there has taken place a remarkable scientific and literary revival, amounting to a true renaissance. In natural science, in law, in philology, in political economy, Italian savants are known and esteemed by their transalpine colleagues, and are on equal terms with them. No country in Europe had so much to do, and none has done so much in so short a time. As a great power Italy has also borne a useful part in the European concert. Sprung as she is from the affirmation of the principles of nationality, popular sovereignty, and freedom, she has always declared herself in favour of conclusions most likely to guard at once peace, liberty, and the interest of nationalities. Her future prosperity ought to be the object of the sincerest good wishes of all civilised countries.

ÉMILE DE LAVELEYE.

## FURTHER REMARKS ON ZULU AFFAIRS.

PERHAPS no apology is needed here for returning to the causes and origin of the Zulu war. Those who are content to regard that war as merely a normal and inevitable incident in the career of an empire with barbarous neighbours, will be satisfied with watching the progress of military events. But those who insist that the war is a great crime, and that its author, whatever may be his private virtues, deserves the sternest reprobation by public opinion, will naturally turn again and again to assure themselves of the evidence for so strong and unwelcome a judgment. It is an instructive measure of popular morality and temper to compare the amount of interest in the military circumstances of the war, with the interest in its policy; and to contrast the readiness with which people have hurried to condemn the general in command, for judging whose conduct they have as yet little material, with their marked unwillingness to criticise and condemn the High Commissioner, where the material for judgment is complete and decisive. There is nothing wonderful in this. Right and wrong are apt to confuse their outlines when the scene is seven thousand miles away. The bonds of honour and equity become slack in men's imagination, when the business in hand is at the other side of the world. But those who still care about being just, and who think of national honour as including other things besides military success, will not grudge the attention that is necessary to measure the truth of the charges made with due knowledge and deliberation against the promoters of the Zulu war: that the provocation was all on our own side, but was preceded by a demonstrable breach of faith involving every element of impolicy and chicane; that it is veiled by pretexts which would be worthless if they were true, and are worse than worthless because they are flagrant misrepresentations; and that it is due at the bottom to a premeditated policy of reconciling the Boers to injustice, by a deadlier and more sanguinary injustice to the Zulus. We ought not always to leave it to posterity to describe a piece of policy in its right language; there is no reason why all criticism of contemporary transactions should be reserved for a historian a hundred years after. It is a mistake to think that a weak feeling for justice is the same thing as a strong judgment for politics. In the present instance many even of those who do not care about being just, and who regard the subordination of politics to morality as mere moonshine, have still been convinced, in spite of their wish to sympathise with any policy of violence, that, whether just or not, our action has been

mistaken and inexpedient. The Secretary of State has administered to the High Commissioner a reprimand, or as much of a reprimand as it is convenient to inflict on one whose judgment and insight had been held up a few months ago as conclusive authority for our action in Afghanistan. But the curb thus put upon the High Commissioner does not end the war, nor stay the slaughter, destruction, disorganization, and malignant animosity of war. The attitude of the minister towards his subordinate is not marked enough to bring home to the conscience of the nation that the war ought never to have been begun; that what we euphemistically call avenging the national honour is persisting in an enormity; and, above all, that the injustice and impolicy of the present action is not an isolated accident of a kind that has never happened before, and is never likely to happen again. The present action is part of a system of policy, which we conceive to be disastrous to the material prosperity, and depraving to the moral sentiment of the governing country; to be obstructive to all chances of progress in civil arrangements among ourselves, while doing nothing to hasten progress among barbarians; and to be pregnant with injury to the great industrial classes, because it necessarily increases the authority of the military classes. The Zulu war is a specially glaring example, but it only points in capital letters an old moral.

Consider the rank hypocrisy of it all. At the very moment that we are pharisaically contemplating England as a trustee of special appointment by the heavenly powers on behalf of the more backward races of the earth, we are massacring them by thousands, we are burning their kraals and carrying off their herds, we are breaking up first one and then another of their rudimentary systems of society, we are preparing the reign and authority of a set of men whose only notion of improvement, on the High Commissioner's own evidence, which I shall presently quote, is to improve these unfortunate wards and clients of ours off the face of the earth. Do the public realise, for example, what is meant by the easy phrase of a Native Contingent? It is English for Bashi-Bazouks. In 1876 the then Governor of Cape Colony wrote a letter to the Boer President of the Transvaal, who was at that time going to war with Sico-ceni. He warns the President that in going to war his responsibility will be very seriously increased "if the campaign is carried on contrary to the practice of civilised warfare, by mercenaries who are to be paid by the booty they capture, and the lands from which they succeed in expelling the inhabitants by fire and sword, or, worse still, by native allies, like the Swazies, who have already shown in the attack on Johannesburg kraal how little they think of slaughtering women and children."<sup>1</sup> Yet though we warned the Boers in this

(1) See on this point Mr. Chesson's excellent pamphlet, *The War in Zululand*, pp. 25—

emphatic way how disgraceful it would be to employ Swazies, that has not prevented us now from trying to employ Swazies against Cetywayo; and we, too, have promised our mercenaries shares of the booty that they capture.

All this, it will be said, is merely an incident of war in wild regions. It may be so; and if it were so, what better reason could there be why a civilised power, with self-respect and a spirit of humanity within it, should keep clear of a policy which drags us into regions and wars that commit us to these infamies. For is it not an infamy, that England with all her professions, and after all the beneficent things that her people in so many parts of the world have done before this, should now fling herself for the extension of her empire on the malignant hatreds of savage tribes, should kindle the flames of their covetousness, should place in their hands the arms which her civilisation has enabled her to bring to perfection, and then should bid them slay and burn without mercy or quarter, because Sir Bartle Frere hopes that "the Great Power which overrules the doings of mankind may direct the issue for the future happiness of the Zulu race and our own"? I dare say that in a military ordinance here and there you may for decency's sake find some words enjoining the practices of civilised nations and so forth. The Turks used plenty of such words to their Bashi-Bazonks, and as sincerely as the English, no doubt; but any man of sense will know for himself how fine words will be likely to restrain a savage in the red glare of battle. It is as though a Cuban slaveholder who had just let loose his bloodhounds on the track of an unhappy fugitive, should assure us that, lest they should go too far, he had read to them before starting some verses from the Sermon on the Mount.

As we have said, Sir Bartle Frere has now put his defence before his official superiors in the most complete form of which it is capable, and a lamer exculpation for involving his country in war has never been submitted by any satrap in the history of unwieldy empires. We have heard of men who answer arguments or objections after what a biographer of James the Second has called the Italian manner. King James used always to reply by exactly repeating his own original proposition, and this is what Sir Bartle Frere does. There are even capable men who hear, but do not listen. Their minds are not penetrated by an objection; they are impervious to an unwelcome impression; and after an interval of seeming candour, you find that they have never for an instant left the point to which they had originally fixed themselves. In company with a strong judgment,

26. "The attempt to force the Zulus residing in Natal to fight their fellow-countrymen who live in Zululand calls for earnest protest. For thirty years past we have endeavoured to wean the Natal Zulus from warlike pursuits; but now this wise and prudent policy has been reversed, and even Christian Zulus living on mission stations are summoned to fight the Zulu king."

this might make a powerful ruler. But Sir Bartle Frere's judgment, at least since these affairs came into his hands, is condemned even by the Secretary of State, who would (properly enough) certainly not condemn him if he could help it. He is unable to see facts as they are. He assures the Government in his despatch of Jan. 24 that he has "spared no pains, by patient use of reasonable conciliation and compromise" &c., &c., and he would ask "whether it would be possible to carry compromise and conciliation further." Why, there is not one single step that the High Commissioner has taken, from the first collection of forces on the frontier down to the promulgation of the ultimatum, which has not been, and has not been pointed out to him as being, a direct and certain provocation to war! Of conciliation and compromise there has not been a vestige. How should there have been on the part of an officer with Sir B. Frere's distinct theory, announced a dozen times in these papers, that a civilised government can only live alongside of a barbaric neighbour on condition of being absolutely supreme over it. On his own showing, he had long lost faith in conciliatory courses. "There may probably have been a time when there was room for effecting something with the Zulu king by conciliation and compromise, but *I see no reason for doubting that such a time, if ever it existed, has many years since past.*"<sup>1</sup> This is one instance among others of the looseness and contradictions of statement to be found in the High Commissioner's despatches; for in the very next paragraph he says he doubts "if anything could have been effected by means of reasonable conciliation since November, 1876." When he said many years, then, he meant less than two years.

It will not be necessary to go over again with Sir Bartle Frere the grounds on which he is accused of launching us into an unnecessary and untimely, and therefore a criminal war. The story of the two sons of Sirayo again appears. The story of the two men who were seen by the Zulus on the frontier taking soundings, who tried to excuse themselves by saying that they were fishing, which they palpably were not doing, and who were finally allowed to go with the loss of a pipe and a pocket-handkerchief, again figures in two laboriously emphasised paragraphs. We have already quoted Sir Henry Bulwer's criticism of Sir Bartle Frere's exaggeration of this incident, which is only important because the High Commissioner has chosen to make it so. *Hæ nuge seria ducunt in mala.* The new blue-book tells us how these two trifles appeared to Bishop Colenso, who is justly described by Sir Bartle Frere himself as "one of the ablest and sincerest friends of the natives, whose great intellectual power and intimate knowledge of the Zulu character and language would, under any circumstances, entitle his views to the highest

respect." At an interview with the High Commissioner, "I ventured to say," the Bishop afterwards writes to him, "that one or two of the demands made on the Zulu king seemed to bear rather hardly upon him under the circumstances, especially after his having recently seized, of his own accord and sent him to this government [Natal], a native accused of murdering a white man. As he was not personally concerned in either of the two cases for which he was fined, one of them having been the rash act of two hot-headed young men in their father's absence, and the other brought on by a fault on our own side, the two white men, who were sent as spies to sound the Tugela for a ford for the crossing of troops, having excused themselves by a transparent falsehood, and thereby confirmed the suspicion of the neighbouring Zulus, who had been watching their proceedings with very natural anxiety at the present crisis."<sup>1</sup> Thus we have two men so different in their point of view as Sir Henry Bulwer and Bishop Colenso, agreeing that evidence on which Sir Bartle Frere lays such stress as against Cetywayo ought not fairly to be regarded as evidence at all. There is not one other of the charges that are supposed to bear on the face of them the warrant for an ultimatum and war, which have not been equally reduced by Sir Henry Bulwer to their true dimensions, and emptied of all the sinister inferences that the High Commissioner persists in finding in them.

There could not be a better exercise for the pupils in a class for Logic or Evidence, than to sift out the grain of proof from the wordy replies of the missionaries to some plain questions as to the violence inflicted or threatened on Zulus in connection with the missions in Zululand during the present king's reign. They were asked for overt acts, names, dates, clear particulars, and specific circumstances. Their answers would be torn to pieces by the youngest lawyer's clerk at the Old Bailey. "We heard, but I cannot give the particulars."—"They did not say it in so many words, but *one felt as if they said.*"—"It will never be known, but *it seems to me* that the king had made up his mind to worry and harass the missionaries."—"I feel perfectly sure that had not so many Christians taken to flight," then there would have been murdering and plundering. And so forth. This kind of criticism may seem very trifling, but it goes to the root of the matter. What we contend is that the case against Cetywayo is the result of exaggeration, panic, race-hatred, the hatred of certain kinds of missionaries for what they call the heathen, and that this hollow case is merely the ostensible plea for a war which was a foregone conclusion, and the object of a preconceived policy. It is not only the right, but the duty, of Englishmen who care about public affairs to examine this

case with the utmost possible closeness. We ought at least to try Cetywayo, where the penalties are war and extermination, as seriously as if he were charged with petty larceny or robbery from a dwelling-house.

After enumerating the items of evidence, Sir Bartle Frere says (par. 20), "This is an imperfect catalogue of those acts by which the Zulu king's disposition and intention may be judged." But it is not the fault of the Secretary of State or of the English public that the catalogue is imperfect. The Commissioner is asked to produce his case against Cetywayo. If he chooses to state the case imperfectly, he has only himself to blame. The truth is that the High Commissioner does not possess any evidence against Cetywayo, except three or four circumstances to which he chooses to give an arbitrary interpretation and an exaggerated force, but which are no sooner written plainly down, than everybody at once sees that they have very little force, either separately or collectively, and are perfectly capable of quite different and much simpler interpretation.

In precisely the same way the High Commissioner deals with another question of proof. When asked why it was impossible to defer a final settlement of the Zulu difficulty, he refers to the general unrest of the native mind, and to mysterious and sinister communications among the various native tribes. We ask what was the nature of these communications. "What may have been the nature of the communications upon the subject," Sir Bartle Frere replies, "it is impossible to say, for no written word ever passes between two chiefs unless they have been educated in the schools of Europeans; and it is only by results that the nature of such communications can in general be known." At least then, we say, you can produce some of these evidentiary results. The answer is a paragraph (§ 52) so vague, un-substantial, and indefinite, both as to anything that deserves to be called a result and as to the authority on which this shadow of a result is treated as a substance, that it is impossible to extract from it a single decisive proposition. And Sir Bartle Frere is conscious of this, for in the following paragraph he says plainly and straightforwardly: "In dealing with illiterate people it is always impossible to give documentary proof, and difficult to convey the effect of a vast number of concurrent items of evidence, each perhaps trivial in itself, but all pointing to one result. I can, therefore, only state to Her Majesty's Government my conviction that the crisis anticipated by Cetywayo, by his envoys, and by the tribes to which they were sent, has arrived, and *I must leave it to the opinion Her Majesty's Government may have of my judgment and power of appreciating such evidence to estimate the weight to be attached to my conclusions.*" That is to say, the High Commissioner admits that he can produce no evidence or proof capable of carrying conviction to the mind of the Secretary of



State and the rest of the world, either that Cetywayo intended to defy the English in South Africa, or that the excitement among the native tribes was so intense and pressing as to make it necessary at all hazards to precipitate a struggle, where our forces were by Sir Bartle Frere's own repeated allegation known to be inadequate.

Now no one is likely to deny that in affairs of this kind, just as in many other kinds of affairs in private no less than in public life, it is possible for emergencies to spring up calling for decisive action, yet in which it would be difficult or impossible to give to all the critical and decisive considerations their due weight by a mere statement of them upon paper. Not only something, but much, must in such situations be left to the discretion and judgment of a responsible ruler; and the insight that is conferred on a really able man by experience may disclose to him perils which he cannot explain in all their weight to others. Parliamentary government does not mean that no public servant—whether he be Prime Minister or High Commissioner in South Africa—is ever to act until he has proved by chapter and verse to Parliament or his intermediate superior that he was bound so to act, and had no alternative of acting otherwise. But if a public servant, being unable to reproduce in detail the arguments that would justify his course, throws himself on our general confidence in him and his judgment and capacity, then he cannot complain if the grounds on which this confidence is claimed are scrutinised with the utmost narrowness and vigilance. Sir Bartle Frere must remember, to begin with, that there are others who have at least as good a right as himself to claim respect for their judgments, and who do not agree either that the so-called ultimatum was judicious, or that instant military action was a matter of urgency. Sir T. Shepstone is on his side, we assume, but then Sir T. Shepstone is most deeply interested; it is his unwise and unnecessary annexation of the Transvaal that had led to the entanglement, and the suppression of Zulu independence is indispensable (though there is every prospect of its being ineffectual), for pacifying his unwilling Boer subjects. Sir Henry Bulwer, on the contrary, has no bias of this kind, and he, while allowing the situation to be critical, presses the importance of putting ourselves right in the boundary dispute, urges caution, and condemns the precipitancy of the ultimatum.<sup>1</sup> Sir Bartle Frere not only does not give us an adequate proof of the necessity for instant war, but he does give us adequate proof that any confidence in his judgment, his clearheadedness, his sagacity, and above all in his ability to discern the difference between right and wrong, is entirely misplaced and undeserved. It is worth while to enumerate, from the criticisms of the Bishop of Natal, some of the illustrations of Sir Bartle Frere's fashion of dealing with facts that make against him.

(1) C. 2222, p. 37. Quoted in the last number of this Review, p. 340.

1. Sir B. Frere says that he can find "nothing on record from Panda but vague grumbings about Boer encroachments," and that "Cetywayo made no formal complaints, that he can find, till Sir T. Shepstone's visit to him in 1873, when he must have felt comparatively secure on the throne, and had nothing to lose by challenging the Boers' rights to the land he had promised and made over to them."

There are fifty passages in the Blue-books which prove that the Zulus never ceased to make those formal complaints of which Sir Bartle Frere, shutting fast both his eyes, can see no record. Here is one, which in itself is sufficiently decisive, from Sir T. Shepstone himself:—

"This may be regarded as the true state of the case in 1856: the Blood River then became the boundary, and cut off from Zululand all territory above its confluence with the Buffalo. *It is the occupation of territory to the eastward of this stream, against which protests and complaints have been so persistently made by the Zulus. These complaints took a serious form in 1861, and the foundation* was then laid of all the ill-feeling that now exists between the emigrant farmers now subject to the South African Republic and the Zulus on the question called the Disputed Territory,

"Panda, who was still living, repudiated the bargain, and Cetshwayo denied it. *The Zulus have never ceased to threaten and protest; and the Government of Natal, to whom these protests and threats have been continually made, has frequently, during a course of fifteen years [i.e. from 1861], found it very difficult to impress the Zulus with the hope and belief that an amicable solution of the difficulty would one day be found, provided that they refrained from reprisals or the use of force.*"

2. Sir B. Frere says that "the recent offers to arbitrate were by no means willingly accepted by Cetywayo." There is no kind of ground for any such assertion. On the contrary, it is well known that Cetywayo, who had always wished the Natal Government to arbitrate between himself and the Transvaal Government, expressed his satisfaction that the claims of his nation, as against the new English Government, were to be submitted to arbitration. And his welcome of the proposal was to be found at large in the papers which Sir B. Frere had in his hand, at the very time when he has the courage to say that Cetywayo by no means willingly accepted the offer to arbitrate.

"Cetywayo hears what the Governor of Natal says about sending for people from across the sea, if Cetywayo wishes it, to settle the question of the boundary between the Transvaal and the Zulus, and thanks him for these words, for they are all good words that have been sent to Cetywayo by the Governor of Natal; they show that the Natal Government still wishes Cetywayo to drink water and live.

"Before sending for people across the sea, for the settlement of the boundary, Cetywayo would be glad if the Governor of Natal would send his representatives to see what the claims of Cetywayo are, and hear what he says, and to

hear what the others say, and if these cannot come to an understanding on the matter, then a letter can be sent beyond the sea for other people to come and see what can be done.

“Cetywayo thanks the Governor for the words which say that the ground in dispute should not be occupied while the matter is being talked over. He says he did not send to have the kraal built that trouble might arise. He did it because his people were already living on the ground in dispute and even beyond it.

“Cetywayo says he hears it said that he intends to make war upon the Transvaal. He wishes the Natal Government to watch well and see when he, Cetywayo, will do such a thing, for if he attended to the wish of the English Government in Natal when it said he must not make war upon the Transvaal Boers, why should he wish to do so upon those who are now of the same great house as Natal to whose voice he listened?”

This is the unwilling acceptance of offers to arbitrate!

3. Sir B. Frere alleges that Cetywayo “pushed forward his military kraals on to the ground occupied by Transvaal grantees.” The facts are that before the Commission began its inquiries into the disputed boundary, one kraal was begun, but was abandoned on a message from Sir T. Shepstone. Afterwards, when Cetywayo had heard that the decision was in his favour, another kraal was begun, which, as the quotation from Sir H. Bulwer last month showed, was not a military kraal at all. Its purpose was described by Colonel Durnford:—

“I know the district referred to in which are many Zulu kraals, and believe that if such military kraal is in course of erection it is being constructed that order may be kept among the Zulus there residing, who owe allegiance to the Zulu king alone, in the interests of peace. The fact that the 100 men at work are armed is of no significance, because every Zulu is an armed man, and never moves without his weapon. On a border there is often but little law and order; and the Transvaal one has hitherto proved no exception to the general rule, *i.e.* on the side of the Boers.”

Taking the same view of another transaction which is one of the high charges against Cetywayo, Colonel Durnford says: “I believe that, if the German or other residents near Lüneberg have been ordered to leave, it is not by the orders of the King of Zululand, who is far too wise a man to make a false move at present, when the boundary question between himself and the Transvaal is under consideration.”

4. It is worth while to give particular attention to the following pair of passages, because the inconsistency between them shows what, if it were found in the dealings of a high Russian official, we should find described by some very strong words indeed. In his last Memorandum the High Commissioner says that certain Zulu claims to sovereignty north of the Pongolo “were at the same time negatived.”

But in the Ultimatum, it is announced that "if the King has, or thinks he has, any claims of any nature in that direction, he must state them to the British Government, *by whom they will be duly considered.*" Much good would have come of this due consideration, when the claims had been already negatived beforehand!

We need not again go over the question of the final award as to the disputed territory. I can only repeat after reading the new papers, and after a month's reflection on all that has been said on the other side, that the High Commissioner's course in dealing with the award of the English Commissioners of Inquiry was a piece of lawless and nefarious chicane, which inflicts a deeper stain on the honour and good name of his country than a hundred Isandlanas. The reader will remember that the Zulus had for years contended that certain lands had been stolen from them by the Boers of the Transvaal; that the Natal government had for years sided with them in this contention; that on the annexation of the Transvaal, instead of restoring to them these lands, as policy would have suggested, we placed ourselves in the place of the Boer government as claimants, but submitted a portion of the question to the judgment of a commission of English officers; that this commission found that the Zulus were in the right in their claim, and held triumphantly to this finding, in spite of the attack made upon it by Sir B. Frere and Sir T. Shepstone; and then, finally, that Sir B. Frere, in the teeth of this finding, awarded to them a recognition of their nominal sovereignty, but forbade them under pains and penalties to assert it. What is nominal sovereignty to a Zulu? What he wanted, and what, as the Commission declared, he had a right to, was the beneficial use of the lands for his cattle. It will be better, however, to cite a witness whose knowledge of the circumstances of the case, and of Zulu sentiment and opinion, is beyond dispute. This is an extract from Bishop Colenso's letter to Sir B. Frere on the subject, which exactly confirms the view taken in these pages last month.

"That compensation, either from the Transvaal or Imperial Treasury, should be assured under British guarantee to any farmers who might elect to quit the lands they had occupied under the usurped authority of the Boer Government is, of course, only reasonable and just; but that these farmers should be maintained under British guarantee without regard to the wishes of the Zulu King and nation in the possession of these lands, including (?) the power to alienate them by sale or otherwise for all future generations, though this would hardly have been acquired in any case by grant from the Zulu King and nation,—lands which had been unjustly seized by the Boers, though Cetywayo persistently protested against their encroachments and would long ago have ejected the intruders had he not been restrained by the Natal Government,—does not, I must frankly say, accord with my own sense of justice. . . .

"It would seem, that the award gives back the land *in name* only to the

Zulus, whereas in reality Cetywayo will have no control over it; he will not be able to exercise authority over his own people living on it, without coming into collision immediately with their Boer masters, who would fiercely resent any intrusion on his part on their farms; he will not be able to send any of his people to live on it, or any of his cattle to graze on it, or even to assign places in it to such of his people as may elect to move from the Boer to the Zulu side of the new boundary. . . . .

"I cannot see how we could have any rights whatever in the eyes of just men and civilised peoples, as representatives of the late Transvaal Government, in respect of land to which the Boers had no right, which, as had been long suspected, and as has been now decided 'by a jury carefully selected by ourselves,' the late Transvaal Government had taken by encroachment, and had held in spite of constant protests on the part of the Zulus and appeals to our Government seeking redress for their wrongs. As an honourable nation we were holding it, I should say, since the annexation of the Transvaal, as trustees for the rightful owner, whether the present Transvaal Government or the Zulu people, and were bound, in the words of the message, to 'give up to the Zulu King and nation land which is thought by the Commissioners to be by strict right belonging to the Zulus.' Such restrictions on the free possession of the land as are implied in the appointment of the Resident, I felt we had a right to make, having the power to do so in the interests of humanity and civilisation. But to say that we 'give up the land to the Zulu King and nation,' when we take away from them all power to use it, or the greater part of it, for their own reasonable purposes, seems to me, I must confess, something of a very different character.

"Nor can I understand how any 'private rights' can have grown up under wrongful appropriation of the land for persons who took their farms from the Boer Government, or bought them from others who had so taken them, with full knowledge that the title was disputed, and that the Zulus have all along been vehemently protesting against the wrong, except, of course, as justifying claims in the case of any who might be ejected, for fair compensation from the Government that did the wrong or from the Government that has taken over its liabilities. Such was evidently the feeling of Sir T. Shepstone when he wrote on January 2nd, 1878. 'When I met the Zulu Prime Minister and the indunas, on the 18th October last, on the Blood River, I was fully prepared, if it should be insisted on by the Zulus, as I then thought it might justly be, to give up a tract of country which had from thirteen to sixteen years been occupied by Transvaal farmers, and to whose farms title-deeds had been issued by the late Government, and I contemplated making compensation to these farmers in some way or other for their loss,' and he goes on to speak of this 'land,' which had for so many years been occupied and built upon by the subjects of the Transvaal, to whom the Government of the country was distinctly liable. Are these very farms to become now the permanent property of their holders under British guarantee?"<sup>1</sup>

This is absolutely unanswerable, and if it seems unanswerable to us, how much more must it seem so to the Zulus themselves, who can neither read nor write, and are, we may be sure, little trained in juristic metaphysics.

(1) C. 2252, p. 53, p. 59.

Sir B. Frere's position in answer to the Bishop is a masterpiece of sophistry. It turns upon the distinction between sovereign and proprietary rights—an excellent distinction in the proper time and place—and is to the effect that we ought not to give to Cetywayo "more than we had ourselves, or than we should give to the French or German nation, were we ceding a slice of territory to them, viz. sovereign rights, *not* rights of private property, which happened to have been already established in the land."<sup>1</sup> We may, by the way, at once measure Sir B. Frere's capacity of realising the conditions of the difficult problem in South Africa, that he should thus seriously argue as if a barbarous tribe in the stage of the Zulus, were analogous to advanced nations like the French or the Germans, and were to be dealt with accordingly. Somewhere else he introduces the dispute as to Maine and Oregon in the same way, as analogous to our dispute as to the Transvaal Boundary; and he seriously expects from Cetywayo what he would have a right to expect (but if we may judge from a good many passages in American diplomacy, would be very likely not to find) in President Hayes. This irrational pedantry is matched by the High Commissioner's practice of writing about Cetywayo in language which is utterly inappropriate in style, even if it were not utterly untrue in substance. When we read of Cetywayo's "false and flattering pretences," his "folly and presumption," "his contemptuous disregard," and the like, it is as puerile as when a foolish pedagogue harangues the culprits of a nursery in language that would only be proper if they were systematic breakers of all the Ten Commandments. And when Sir Bartle Frere writes about Cetywayo's soldiers being "trained by a discipline which develops every animal power and instinct till they become parts of a frightfully efficient man-slaying war machine," about "perverse and unnatural development of brute instincts such as is only possible under the iron rule of a despot like Cetywayo," and so on, we feel that we are reading pieces of florid literature, not politics. It is not business, it is *belles lettres*.

Apart from this, mark the obvious logical flaw in the analogy. The whole dispute turned as much on beneficial rights and use, as on sovereign rights. The beneficial rights went with the sovereign rights, were subordinate to them, carried them, followed them. Even if this were not so, the award never gave Cetywayo sovereign rights. He got as little in the way of sovereign rights as he got in beneficial rights. If we were ceding a slice of territory to the French nation, Sir B. Frere would hardly explain to the French negotiator that we gave his government sovereign rights in the said territory, but that we should insist on planting a Resident who should either sit as assessor, or else preside himself, wherever a former

(1) C. 2252, p. 56.

British subject happened to be a party, and have a veto on all stages of the proceedings; that no British subject should be expelled from the ceded territory, until it had been communicated by M. Grévy to the Resident and approved by the Resident. Yet if the cases are analogous, why not? If such a version of cession be a farce in the case of M. Grévy and the French Republic, why, on Sir B. Frere's assumption of an analogy, is it less of a farce in the case of Cetywayo? And cession is not even the right word in Cetywayo's case; it is, or ought to have been, the restoration of a piece of property which we held in trust for the rightful owner, until the rightful owner should be discovered; and, as it was, our jury proved that the Zulus were the rightful owners. Well indeed might Cetywayo cry out against such mockery, and exclaim, "They have flung over my head the skin of the beast, while they are eating all the meat."

The real purpose of all this is explained in a letter written by Sir B. Frere to Bishop Colenso. "Few things," says Sir B. Frere, "seem to me of greater importance than to teach all in South Africa the essential difference between sovereign and private rights. . . . I cannot but think that it will be a blessed day for the whole country when the distinction between sovereign and private rights is generally recognized and observed. . . . The distinction is only very imperfectly acknowledged or appreciated by many of our own brethren; many Englishmen, and a very large proportion of the educated Dutch colonists, have no notion of an assumption of sovereignty by a European Power over native territory, unless the transfer is followed by *the ejection of the greater part of the black population, and by a division of the country into farms to be held exclusively by white immigrants*. That the sovereignty of the Queen should supersede that of the chief; and yet that every native should remain in his place, governed according to our Queen's general ideas of right and wrong, and not by those of Cetywayo; that he should cultivate his own lands, with additional power to divide and sell them; that he should be able to sell them to any other man, whether black or white—is a state of things many of our people find it difficult to comprehend, and generally believe to be impossible. Yet there can be no doubt that there are millions of non-European races over which the Queen rules after the fashion I have described."<sup>1</sup>

This frankly reveals Sir Bartle Frere's real view and intention in the whole transaction. The territory was not to be ceded to Cetywayo or his people at all, either in a natural or non-natural sense: the sovereignty of the Queen was to supersede that of Cetywayo, and every Boer was to remain in his place,

governed according to our Queen's general ideas of right and wrong, and not by those of Cetywayo; in other words, in the case of the disputed territory the principle of annexation was to be inserted at its thin end. This may have been just or unjust, politic or impolitic, but at any rate let us see the transaction as it was. The finding of the Commission was treated as a farce that had miscarried. The usurpations of the Boer trespassers were confirmed. The Queen of England, and not the Zulu king and nation, was to be sovereign, and to insist on the country being governed according to English ideas, and not according to Zulu ideas. All this ought to be said straightforwardly, with candid and honourable brutality. It would be far better so than to deceive ourselves with the idea that we have been acting in accordance with right and justice, whether the right and justice of Zulus or of Englishmen. Contrast the substance of the award with the lofty moral professions of the High Commissioner in a Minute of November:—

“Still less do I think we can adopt a course which I have seen with regret advocated in more than one quarter, viz., that we should avoid carrying out the verdict of the Boundary Commissioners, ‘because any concession to Zulu claims would be regarded by the Zulus as a weakness, and dangerous at the present moment.’ *It is impossible to argue such a proposition on any grounds higher than self-interest*, and the possible avoidance of danger consequent on meting out to others the same justice we should rigidly exact for ourselves. I think we are strong enough to do justice in this matter without fear of consequences. But I am confident that no possible inconvenience we can suffer, or risk we can run, should weigh for a moment against the loss of character consequent on an evasion of our duty.”

A veteran official, when he begins to talk about the grounds of self-interest not being good enough for him, is usually a person to be distrusted. And we feel on much surer ground when Sir B. Frere says plainly that the Queen is to be sovereign in South Africa, and to force the Zulus and others to govern according to English ideas. But if this be really Sir B. Frere's view, we can only read with amazement paragraphs such as that in the Memorandum of November 13, 1878:—“The award of the Commissioners makes over to Zulu possession (!) portions of land which since the annexation of the Transvaal have been under the British flag as Transvaal territory, and persons who in like manner have been under the British flag as British subjects, and who have now therefore a claim, if they choose, either to remove unmo-  
lested with their property into British territory, or if they remain in Zulu territory to live under *what, according to Zulu ideas, is good government.*” But then we are told that it is “according to our



Queen's general ideas of right and wrong, and not by those of Cetywayo," that the government is to be carried on. Which does Sir B. Frere really mean? We can only read with amazement again a paragraph in his exculpatory despatch of January 24, 1879, to the Secretary of State:—"Even now we have asked of Cetywayo nothing but to keep himself to himself, within his own bounds, and to manage his people according to their own ideas of good government in the way he promised, or in any other way which will not be a standing menace to his neighbours" (par. 29). Yet among the items of the ultimatum to which Cetywayo's compliance is required are these: To abolish a military system which he and his ancestors have treated as part of the organization of the tribe; To accept the presence and advice of a British Resident; To permit the return to Zululand and engage for the future protection of missionaries and their converts. Is this to ask nothing of him but to keep himself to himself?

Enough of Sir Bartle Frere. Let us ask ourselves what all these high words about the glories of annexing barbarous tribes really mean. People who think vaguely about things—another way of describing most people—picture to themselves the multiplication of peaceful and thriving villages, the introduction of arts and manufactures, the just administration of good laws, and a thousand other attractive and exciting consequences as all implied in annexation. Sir George Clerk, who as I said last month was sent to the Orange River territory in 1853—4, could hardly find a better argument against our retention of that country than lies in his simple description of what retention means. His picture is true of other territories. "In such a position," says Sir George Clerk, "and under such circumstances, the assertion of British authority would be ludicrous were it not attended with considerable risk of entanglement in strife, reprisals, and warfare. It consists in fact in a dozen Englishmen stuck down in this remote territory, calling themselves a government, with 90,000 Kafirs immediately around; a police such as I have described; an insufficient revenue; no credit; a landjobbing character; with a detachment of troops consisting of 150 British infantry, and 50 Hottentot cavalry, in a starved country whose nearest support is 400 miles off, across a country where severe drought and ox-carriage, with a wretched port, render communication so dilatory, and marching sometimes so difficult, and always so tedious an operation that no reinforcement could reach this after allowing time for a regiment to be received, under the period of a month."<sup>1</sup> Well might he call the retention of such a country "preposterous." A man must indeed be intoxicated with a lust of sovereignty for sovereignty's sake, if he

(1) Further Correspondence respecting Orange River Territory. April 10, 1854.

thinks it worth while to plunge into a war that is not only criminally unjust, but full of danger and prodigiously expensive, and not only one war, but war after war, for the sake of such a cruel parody and caricature of a government as this.

The disguise of great abstract words hides from us what our alleged civilising influence in South Africa really comes to. People talk as if occupation by England meant the dispersion over these benighted lands of thousands of men like Mr. Samuel Morley, or Lord Shaftesbury, or the late Mr. George Moore. How little this is the case, Mr. Froude has told with characteristic energy of diction. "In the English colonies in South Africa, at any rate," he says, "there are a set of people who answer to the mean whites of the Southern States of America. *A large portion of our people are more or less vagabonds.*" Land-swindlers, miners in search of work, liquor-dealers anxious for new openings for trade, spurious gold-hunters, broken-down speculators, reckless adventurers of every species,—these are our contributions to civilising and Christian influences.<sup>1</sup> These are Sir B. Frere's "peace-loving and civilised men of European descent." Is it to make a career for knaves and desperadoes like these that we are to endure the ever-increasing burden of South African wars?

The Boers are not on the whole a very elevated race of men, but even Sir B. Frere in his last despatch admits that justice has not been done to these courageous "pioneers of civilisation." It is rather late in the day to begin to pay compliments to people whose free government we have just suppressed, but we may accept the fact that the Boers have done at any rate as much towards what is called carrying civilisation into the wilderness as the English. While the English trade and speculate, as good authorities tell us, the Dutch cultivate the soil; while the English, as soon as ever they have made money, hasten away from a land that to them is never more than a land of exile, the Dutch farmers make it a home and settle in it, and establish a system of life in it, not the highest, but stable, normal, and with possibilities of regular improvement in it. If we do not change our ways, we are warned, the Boers will be the ruling race in South Africa. Let them be so. Why not? England does not owe it either to Kaffirs or any other people to degrade herself into a great military empire for their sake. She has already obligations enough and too many; far more than she can discharge as well as they ought to be discharged.

The future has been depicted for us by one of that school of politicians who think it a glorious and noble thing for a nation to waste and destroy its capital, lavishly to augment its burdens, and with a

(1) For a graphic account of some of these types, the reader may be referred to a book recently published by Messrs. Blackwood, *The Transvaal of To-day*, by Alfred Aylward, pp. 150—155.

light heart to plunge into one barren enterprise after another. After we have punished Cetywayo, says this writer, still "the inherent difficulties of government will, as in India, survive the occasion. Whatever be the natural resources of the dependency, the colonists will never pay for the necessary securities. They are among the most unwilling taxpayers in the world. Thus the defence of South Africa will practically be conducted by the British army at the cost of the British Exchequer—and *we all know what that comes to. There will be a spasmodic energy when the emergency arises, followed by persistent neglect and starvation when it has passed away.* The liabilities of this country are so far more serious in South Africa than in India, that there is no prospect of their being met by consistent government or adequate military equipment or competent generalship."<sup>1</sup>

It would be natural to suppose that this indisputable preamble was the introduction to a strong exhortation to abandon the policy of extending liabilities. On the contrary it is a despairing reproach. What we contend is that exactly because this account is true, and because the history of our supremacy will be, and must be, a constant alternation of energy with neglect, therefore we should leave an enterprise that bears wastefulness and ineffectiveness stamped broadly on the very front of it. There will be every few years the old story. The colonists will get themselves into trouble or panic; and then, as a former commander in South Africa has described the process, "the British soldier will be implored to come to the assistance of the colony, generous Old England will be asked once more to pay the bill, and the colonists will be ready to send waggons and teams of oxen, with supplies at fabulous prices."<sup>2</sup> As another writer has put it, more widely:—"England must pay for colonial military purposes, because there is a class that is daily annexing fresh lands, undertaking new responsibilities, and incurring increasing expense for the purpose of extending its own influence and creating vacancies for an ever-increasing colony of hungry expectants. . . . A class exists that has a policy distinct from that of the English people, independent of parliament, and though unknown or unanalysed at home, yet carried on in the name and by the power of England."

It is for the people of England to decide whether this shall be or not; whether they are content to be taxed for the pleasure of men who unite the mean avarice of hucksters to the lawless violence of buccaneers; and whether the old realm which was once the home of justice and freedom, is to be transformed into a Pirate-Empire, with the Cross hypocritically chalked upon its black flag.

EDITOR.

(1) *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 18.

(2) Sir Arthur Cunynghame's *My Command in South Africa*, p. 169.

## WHAT IS MONEY?

PROFESSOR JEVONS, in his excellent little book on "Money," tells us that the ingenious attempts that have been made to define money "involve the logical blunder of supposing that we may, by settling the meaning of a single word, avoid all the complex differences and various conditions of many things, requiring each its own definition." Without denying that this blunder has been sometimes committed, I think it misleading to suggest, as Mr. Jevons does, that the attempt to define a class-name necessarily implies a neglect of the specific differences of the things contained in the class. Indeed, when he goes on to say that the many things which are or may be called money—"bullion, standard coin, token coin, convertible and inconvertible notes, legal tender and not legal tender, cheques of various kinds, mercantile bills, exchequer bills, stock certificates, &c."—"require each its own definition," he apparently maintains the rather paradoxical position that it is logically correct to give definitions of a number of species, but logically erroneous to try to define their common genus. It is easy to show that several at least of these more special notions present just the same sort of difficulties when we attempt to determine them precisely as the wider notion "money" does. For instance, the distinction between bullion and coin seems at first sight plain enough; but when we ask under which head we are to classify gold pieces circulating at their market value in a country that has a single silver standard, we see that it is not after all so easy to define coin. The characteristic of being materially coined—that is, cut and stamped by authority—though it has always been combined in our own experience with the characteristic of being legal tender, is capable of being separated from it; so that we have to choose between the two in our definition. So again, we may ask, what makes a coin a token? Does a seignorage sufficient to cover the expense of coining have this effect? If not, why not? and what further difference is required between the value of coin and the value of the metal contained in it? Similarly, we may inquire whether by calling notes convertible it is merely meant that their issuer has promised to convert them into coin on demand, or whether a belief is affirmed that he would so convert them if required? If the latter alternative be chosen, it must be evident that the legitimacy of such a belief must depend upon the nature and extent of the provisions made by the issuer for meeting demands of coin; so that in order to define convertibility precisely we shall have to determine what provisions are adequate, and whether all possible demands should be provided for or only such as may reasonably be expected. Then further, how shall we

treat the case—which used to be common in the United States<sup>1</sup>—of notes for which coin will almost certainly be paid if demanded, but not without a serious loss of good-will to the demander? In short, we cannot escape the proverbial difficulties of drawing a line, if we attempt to use any economic terms with precision; and instead of seeing in these difficulties—as Professor Jevons seems to do—a ground for not making the attempt, I venture to take an exactly opposite view of them. I think that there is no method so convenient for bringing before the mind the “complex differences and various conditions” of the matters that it is occupied in studying, as just this effort to define general terms. The gain derived from this process (as I have urged in a previous paper<sup>2</sup>) is quite independent of its success. We may find that the reasons for drawing any proposed line between money and things rather like money are balanced and indecisive. But since such reasons must consist in statements of the important resemblances and differences of the things that we are trying to classify, the knowledge of them must be useful in economic reasoning, whatever definition we may ultimately adopt.

Let me then raise once more the vexed question—What is money? But first, we must observe that when proposed in this form the problem is fundamentally ambiguous; as it blends the two quite distinct questions, (1) What *do* we call money? and (2) What *ought* we to call money? I am inclined to think that the “intellectual vertigo,” which has been said to attack all writers who approached this “fatal theme,” may be partly traced to the want of a clear separation between these two very different issues, and the different methods of discussion respectively appropriate to each. The first point has obviously to be settled entirely by reference to the current use of language. In fact it is not strictly an economic question at all, but a linguistic one; only it is a linguistic question which it requires a certain amount of economic knowledge to answer satisfactorily. For though we have all of us something to do with money, most of us are even painfully conscious that our acquaintance with it is very limited. We commonly recognise that there are certain classes of persons, bankers, merchants, writers of city articles, &c., who are especially occupied in considering and discussing money and its relations from a practical point of view. Hence it is their use of the term which we shall naturally begin by investigating. If there is any one who ought to know what is meant by money, they ought to know.

At the very outset of our inquiry a curious phenomenon presents itself. There seems to be a tolerable accord among our monetary experts<sup>3</sup> in England, at the present time, as to the answer that ought to

(1) See Prof. F. A. Walker's book on “Money,” c. xxi. pp. 481—2.

(2) See the *Fortnightly Review* for February, 1879.

(3) I may refer the reader, for example, to Tate's “Cambist,” Seyd's “Bullion and the Foreign Exchanges,” Nicholson's “Science of Exchanges,” &c.

be given to the question What is money? when they directly attempt to answer it; at any rate, the extent to which they differ is inconsiderable in comparison with the extent of their agreement. Unfortunately the answer so given is in palpable discrepancy with their customary use of the term when they are not trying to define it; and this discrepancy is not of a minor kind, but as fundamental as can well be conceived. When the question is expressly raised they have no doubt that by money they mean what they also call currency, that is, coin and bank-notes. They see the need of distinguishing the latter as paper money or paper currency; and they recognise the existence of a narrower definition which restricts the term money to coined metal, on the view that bank-notes are mere promises to pay money, which ought not to be confounded with money, however currently they may be taken for it. But they are disposed to reject this view as a heresy; and though the narrower sense is that adopted by several economists of repute, I imagine that it would be regarded as at least old-fashioned by practical men; except so far as the word is quite technically employed in relation to the details of banking business. Again, our authorities allow that there is a certain resemblance between bank-notes and bills of exchange, letters of credit, promissory notes issued by private persons, &c.; but though they may perhaps regard these latter as constituting an "auxiliary currency," they do not consider them to be currency in the strictest sense, and therefore do not call them money. The only important point on which their utterances are doubtful or conflicting is the question whether notes issued by private banks and not made legal tender should be considered as money; the importance of this question, however, so far as England is concerned, is continually diminishing. But when bankers and merchants, or those who write for them, are talking of "money" in the sense in which, generally speaking, they are most practically concerned with it—of money which (or, more strictly, the temporary use of which) is continually valued and bought and sold in the money market, which is sometimes scarce and dear and at other times cheap and plentiful—they speak of something which must be defined quite differently. For though coin and bank-notes form a specially important part of money-market money, they certainly cannot constitute the whole of it in any country where deposit-banking is fully developed and payment by cheques customary; and in England, at present, they do not constitute even the greater part of it.

What has just been said will appear to some of my readers a truism. But there are probably more to whom it will appear a paradox; and for the sake of these latter it will be well to pause and illustrate pretty fully this use of the term money. For this purpose I shall take Bagehot's *Lombard Street* as my authority. I do this not merely on account of the marked popularity of this little

book, which is now in its sixth edition ; but because Bagehot united practical and theoretical qualifications for dealing with this subject, such as have rarely been combined in any single man. He was himself a banker ; he was, as editor of the *Economist*, in the habit of writing for bankers and merchants, so that "he that went by rail" might read ; while, at the same time, he was a master of abstract economic theory, thoroughly acquainted with the criticisms that theorists have passed on the common language and ways of thinking of dealers in money. Hence we may be sure that his sense of the term money is deliberately chosen ; not, perhaps, as the sense he would have adopted if he had assumed the linguistic liberty of a purely theoretical writer, but, at any rate, as a sense which he found so fixed in the ordinary thought and discourse of his readers as to render it inexpedient for him to try and modify it.

What, then, is the money of Lombard Street, the possession of which makes England "the greatest moneyed country in the world" ? The answer is very simple. It is a commodity of which the greater part exists only in the shadowy form of what is sometimes called bankers' credit, but may be more definitely conceived as bankers' obligations to pay money on demand ; such credit or obligations being not even embodied in bank-notes. It is true that Bagehot never says that he means this by money, but there are many passages in which it is clear that he can mean nothing else. Take, for example, the following :—

"Every one is aware that England is the greatest moneyed country in the world ; every one admits that it has much more immediately disposable and ready cash than any other country. But very few persons are aware how much greater the ready balance—the floating loan-fund, which can be lent to any one for any purpose—is in England than it is anywhere else in the world. A very few figures will show how large the London loan-fund is, and how much greater it is than any other. The known deposits—the deposits of banks which publish their accounts—are, in

London (31st December, 1872) . . . . .	£120,000,000
Paris (27th February, 1873) . . . . .	13,000,000
New York (February, 1873) . . . . .	40,000,000
German Empire (31st January, 1873) . . . . .	8,000,000

And the unknown deposits—the deposits in banks which do not publish their accounts—are in London much greater than those in any other of these cities. The bankers' deposits of London are many times greater than those of any other city—those of Great Britain many times greater than those of any other country."

Here Bagehot clearly regards these bankers' deposits as "immediately disposable and ready cash," or, as he afterwards calls it, "money-market money." If, then, we ask ourselves where and in what form this money exists, it must be evident that, at any given time, most of it exists only in the form of liabilities or obligations, acknowledged by rows of figures in the bankers' books ; and that it is transferred from owner to owner, and thus fulfils all the functions of a medium of exchange, without ever changing its form.

Most of us, no doubt, have had a vague impression that these figures in bankers' books "represent" sovereigns or bank-notes; which, though they are not actually in the banker's possession, have yet passed through his hands, and exist somewhere in the commercial world. But I need hardly say to any one who has read *Lombard Street* that this cannot be Bagehot's view; since the main drift of that book is to bring prominently forward the fact that, in consequence of the "one-reserve system" upon which English banking is constructed, but little of this immense "loan-fund which can be lent to any one" could possibly be presented in the shape of coin or bank-notes. Of course some portion of the money lent by London bankers is continually taken from them in this shape. But a little reflection on the mode in which it is borrowed and used will show how comparatively small this portion is. Such loans are chiefly made to traders, either directly by the bankers or through the agency of the bill-brokers; and when a trader borrows from his bank, he almost always does so by having the loan placed to his credit in his banker's books, and drawing against it by cheques; and the effect of such cheques, for the most part, is not to cause the money to be produced in the form of coin or notes, but merely to transfer it to some other person's account at the same or some other bank. The bank-notes and gold are merely the small change of such loans; and it is only when money is lent to manufacturers and farmers, who have large sums to pay in wages, that the amount of this change bears even a considerable proportion to the whole loan. It may seem that when cheques on one bank are paid into another, material money must pass between bank and bank. But by the system of the Clearing House the mutual claims of the different banks are set off against each other; so that, even when the balance daily due from each bank to others was paid in notes, the amount of these required was very small in proportion to the amount of liabilities transferred; and now no notes are commonly needed at all, as such balances are paid by drafts on the Bank of England, where the other banks keep the main part of their reserves.

But we may reach the same result more briefly by means of a few statistics, which I may conveniently take from Mr. Inglis Palgrave, whose *Notes on Banking* were published almost contemporaneously with Bagehot's book. Mr. Palgrave estimates the whole amount of deposits held by English, Scotch, and Irish banks (exclusive of the discount-houses) on the 12th of March, 1873, at about 486 millions, the liabilities of the London banks alone being about 179 millions: while he estimates the metallic circulation of the whole kingdom in 1872 at about 105 millions, and the note circulation at 43 millions. If we consider that more than 10 millions of notes and coin, on the average, were kept as reserve by the Bank of England, and that the provincial banks require a considerably larger proportion



of coin for their daily business than the London banks, we shall require no elaborate proof to convince us that the greater part of the "unequalled loan-fund" of Lombard Street can never emerge from the immaterial condition of bankers' liabilities.

The difficulty, indeed, is not to prove this, but rather to explain why this obvious truth is overlooked, or even implicitly denied in so much of what is said and written about money.<sup>1</sup> Even Bagehot frequently uses language which suggests that what banks receive on deposit and lend to traders and manufacturers is entirely legal tender, coin or bank-notes. Take, for example, a passage (p. 142) where he is arguing that the rise in general prices in 1871 was due partly to "cheap money" :—

"It might be said at first sight that so general an increase must be due to a depreciation of the precious metals. . . . And, indeed, there plainly is a diminution in the *purchasing power* of money, though that diminution is not general and permanent, but local and temporary. The peculiarity of the precious metals is that their value depends for unusually long periods on the quantity of them which is in the market. In the long run, their value, like that of all others, is determined by the cost with which they can be brought to market. But for all temporary purposes, it is the supply in the market which governs the price, and that supply in this country is exceedingly variable."

One cause of this variation, he goes on to explain, which operates during the depressed period that follows a commercial crisis, is that the

"savings of the country increase considerably faster than the outlet for them. A person who has made savings does not know what to do with them. And this new unemployed saving means additional money. Till a saving is invested or employed it exists only in the form of money: a farmer who has sold his wheat and has £100 'to the good,' holds that £100 in money, or some equivalent for money, till he sees some advantageous use to be made of it. Probably he places it in a bank, and this enables it to do more work. If £3,000,000 of coin be deposited in a bank, and it need only keep £1,000,000 as a reserve, that sets £2,000,000 free, and is for the time equivalent to an increase of so much coin."

This passage certainly suggests that "saving," as actually performed in England at present, consists either in depositing coin with a banker, or at least in doing something which has the same effect as depositing coin; and that the business of a banker normally consists in lending about two-thirds of the coin thus paid in to him. But it must be evident that what each of us chiefly deposits when he saves is represented by cheques, dividend warrants, &c.; and that by these he merely transfers to his own banker the obligations towards himself that other bankers have incurred, together with the right of collecting corresponding sums of money from these other bankers. And the total effect of this process on the aggregate of banks cannot possibly be to increase directly the

(1) A special exception has to be made in favour of Mr. McLeod, whose *Theory of Banking* contains, so far as I know, the first clear and full exposition of the nature and functions of bankers' deposits. In saying this, I must guard myself against being understood to approve of Mr. McLeod's general treatment of economics.

amount of "loanable money ;" it can only influence this indirectly, so far as the saving diminishes the amount of legal tender which the bankers' customers require for their expenditure from day to day, and by thus increasing the proportion which the bankers' notes and coin bear to their liabilities, induces them to extend the latter. No doubt, to a certain extent, increased saving leads to a direct transfer of coin and bank-notes from the circulation to the bankers' cash-boxes ; and this is especially the case with *provincial* saving, which is largely performed by farmers and retail tradesmen. Still, the phenomenon of cheap money in Lombard Street, for which Bagehot is trying to account, should be explained by reference rather to a decrease in the demand for loans than to any positive increase in the supply of loanable money directly caused by the process of saving.

I need hardly say that I do not attribute to such writers as Bagehot any settled misapprehension of the real nature of what they call money. But I think that their language is apt to mislead persons less familiar with the facts ; and that it further has some tendency to confuse their own reasonings. Thus even Bagehot seems hardly aware that he uses the phrase "ready cash" in two different significations. In one sense, as we saw, England is said to have "much more ready cash" than any other country. That is, she has much more of the immaterial money which exists in the form of bankers' obligations to render material money if required. For of this latter, as he goes on to explain, England has comparatively little ; the amount of our "cash in hand" (in this sense) "is so exceedingly small that a bystander almost trembles at its minuteness compared with the immensity of the credit that rests upon it." The truth is that the same thing presents itself to him in the opposite characters of credit and cash, according to the point of view from which he regards it. When he is considering possible crises and collapses of credit, the difference between bankers' liabilities and their means of meeting them becomes only too palpable ; so that the latter, as "cash in hand" is naturally contrasted with the former. But in ordinary times "book-money," as I have called it, is generally preferred as a medium of exchange to gold or bank-notes, involving as it does not only less trouble but less apparent risk ; since a man is more afraid of having his gold or notes stolen, than he is of his banker breaking. Since, then, each depositor is aware that he only leaves his money in its immaterial condition for his own convenience, and that he can convert any portion of his bankers' liabilities into gold or notes at will, he naturally comes to conceive the former as "ready cash" no less than the latter.

In this way we may partly explain the paradox which I noticed at starting, that money is expressly defined by most of those who write about it in a manner which implicitly excludes the greater part

of the medium of exchange, which (as they are aware) is commonly lent and borrowed under the name of money in England. But a further explanation may be found in the view which influential economists have taken of the current commercial use of the terms money and the value of money. This view contains, or at least suggests, an important element of truth; but the statement of it, which I find (*e.g.*) in Mill's treatise, seems to me seriously misleading, and indeed calculated to shroud the whole matter in an impenetrable fog of confused thought.

Mill begins his chapter on the Value of Money<sup>1</sup> by "clearing from our path a formidable ambiguity of language," by which, as he explains, money is commonly confounded with capital.

"When one person lends to another," he says, "what he really lends is so much capital; the money is the mere instrument of the transfer. But the capital usually passes from the lender to the receiver through the means either of money, or of an order to receive money, and at any rate it is in money that the capital is computed and estimated. Hence, borrowing capital is universally called borrowing money; the loan market is called the money market . . . . and the equivalent given for the use of capital, or, in other words, interest, is not only called the interest of money, but, by a grosser perversion of terms, the value of money."

Now, I do not deny that there is an ambiguity in the phrase, value of money; but there seems to me a second equally serious ambiguity in the language that Mill uses in exposing the first. No doubt, when the value of money is mentioned in Lombard Street, it is not the purchasing power of money, measured in commodities, that is intended; but neither is it exactly the rate of interest, as Mill elsewhere uses this phrase, *i.e.* the average annual return to capital, subtracting insurance for risk and wages of management. It is, in fact, the value of the temporary use, not of capital generally, but of money in particular; estimated, as other values are commonly estimated, in terms of money. It is quite true that people often speak of the interest paid for the use of capital in other forms, as the "interest of their money;" but they are aware that it is money invested, and I do not think they really confound this with ready money. They must know that the interest of invested money, or capital generally, may vary comparatively little, while the price paid for the use of ready money is fluctuating through all the stages of a financial crisis; rising perhaps as high as ten per cent., and then falling as low as two per cent. But even if we admit that what is called interest of money should often be rather termed interest of capital, it is still misleading to say that by borrowing money we really mean borrowing capital; since, as Mill elsewhere observes, "loanable capital is all of it in the form of money," and therefore the antithesis is obviously inappropriate.

(1) *Polit. Econ.* b. iii. c. viii.

The truth is that Mill, in his account of Money and Credit, is rather too much influenced by his desire to guard against two errors. In the first place he wishes to dispel completely the illusory assumption, which he regards as the basis of the old Mercantile System, that "wealth consists solely of money." Whether this illusion ever did really "overmaster the mind of every politician in Europe," I do not now inquire; perhaps we inevitably exaggerate the errors of our predecessors in the intellectual struggle that rids us of them; at any rate the doctrine is now happily defunct. But there is a more subtle confusion of the same kind which Mill also effectively exposes; the tendency to infer increase of wealth from what is merely increase of money, and to imagine that we are all better off when we have only got "more counters to reckon with." In the laudable effort to crush this fallacy, Mill is occasionally led to depreciate unduly the importance of money, and to speak of it as if it were not really "wealth" or "capital" at all; intermittently forgetting that "money being the instrument of an important public and private purpose is rightly regarded as wealth," and, since it is indispensable to the most effective production, as capital also. Thus, he tells us that "there cannot be a more insignificant thing than money, except in its character as a contrivance for sparing time and labour." It is not so much *what* is here said that is misleading, as the tone in which it is said. We might with equal truth affirm that there cannot be a more insignificant thing than a steam-engine, except in its character as a contrivance for generating and applying steam-power. But Mill's sentence certainly suggests that money is something that we could easily do without; whereas his real aim is not to depreciate the economic importance of the function of money, but merely to urge that this function will be no better fulfilled by a larger amount than by a smaller; provided that our habits and customs of distribution and exchange are duly adapted to the smaller amount. Similarly, the statement that "when one person lends to another, what he transfers is not the mere money, but a right to a certain value of the produce of the country, to be selected at pleasure," is unsatisfactory, though it is in a sense incontrovertible. A man only borrows money in order to buy something else, or to pay for something already bought; but what he actually borrows is money, and it is essentially inexact to represent him as borrowing anything else. The bad effects of this inexactness are, indeed, latent so long as we are dealing with metallic money; for when commodities are bought and sold for hard coin, it is impossible to ignore the fact that they are transferred by means of an instrument which is equal in value to the wealth that it is used to transfer. But when bankers' credit is the medium of exchange, it is easier to let this fact drop out of sight; and Mill continually does so. Thus he speaks contemptuously of an "extension of credit being talked of . . . as

if credit actually were capital," whereas it is only "permission to use the capital of another person." Now, in a certain rather strained way, we might say this of gold coin; its function is to "permit" or enable its owner to obtain and use other wealth. And it is only in this sense that Mill's statement is true of the credit or liabilities which a banker lends to his customers, whether in the form of notes, or under the rather misleading name of "deposits." This credit, no doubt, is a comparatively fragile and perishable instrument for transferring wealth; like the magic money of the Arabian Nights, it is liable to be turned by a financial crisis into "worthless leaves" of written or printed paper: still, so long as it is commonly accepted in final settlement of debts, it has not only precisely the same function as gold coin, but also precisely the same market value; viz. the interest or discount that is paid for the use of it. And probably those who have "talked of credit as capital" have never meant to imply more than this.

At the same time, as I said, there is an element of truth suggested by the statement that "borrowing money is really borrowing [other] capital;" and it is an element all the more important to bring out, as it is inevitably ignored in most of what is written about the money market. It is true that the existence of these vast amounts of bankers' credit depends on the concomitant existence of corresponding amounts of wealth of other kinds, which are transferred by means of it. While it is needful for clearness of thought to insist that the "loanable capital" of Lombard Street is merely money—in the wider sense above explained,—and most of it immaterial money, it is no less necessary for completeness of view to bear in mind that this immaterial money is only kept in being by the continued exercise of its function. There would not actually be these millions of it in London, if London were not the greatest emporium in the world, and therefore a centre through which many more millions' worth of commodities is continually passing.<sup>1</sup>

Let us now sum up briefly the different uses of "money" which we have found to be more or less current. We may conveniently arrange them in order, according to their width of meaning. First will come the narrowest use, which is also the earliest, to denote coined metal. Next there is the sense universally recognised in the definitions now given by monetary experts, which includes besides coin such "paper money" as is "legal tender." Thirdly, there is the wider use which such experts sometimes, though not most commonly admit, in which bank-notes that are not legal tender are taken in. Fourthly, there is the still wider signification, which we

(1) In saying this, I do not mean to ignore the possibility that London might remain a banking centre, even after the greater part of its trade had passed to other cities. But this could only occur in a more highly developed state of international trade than the present, and such a development would not be possible, if London had not previously been a great centre of trade.

have found to be current in the language of Lombard Street, though it is not often expressly recognised, according to which bankers' liabilities not represented by notes constitute the larger part of the so-called money. All these four—metallic money, paper money of both kinds, and "book money"—have the same exchange value, are lent and borrowed for the same interest or discount, and in ordinary times are currently accepted in final settlement of all debts—except, of course, the debts of bankers. It is by this latter characteristic especially that "book money" is distinguished from other kinds of credit which are not regarded as "money in hand;" in particular from bills of exchange, since the liabilities represented by these, though they may serve as a medium of exchange no less than bankers' liabilities, are always ostensibly to be liquidated at some definite time; hence they are not looked on as finally settling transactions, and so are not commonly regarded as money. The same remark applies to exchequer bills, as these are not absolutely convertible into legal tender to the amount they nominally represent, except at certain definite times. For similar reasons cheques are not commonly held to be money, though they perform some of the functions of money, since a transaction settled by cheque is not finally completed until the cheque has been paid in and money transferred from the drawer's banking account to that of the presenter of the cheque at the same or some other bank. In the case of cheques, however, there is the further difference that the cheques themselves do not exactly "circulate," though the liabilities transferred by means of them do. Still less, again, are securities, such as Government bonds or railway debentures or shares, regarded as ready money, since there is no time at which they are convertible into coin for a fixed amount: when taken in liquidation of a debt they must always first be sold like any other goods, or at least estimated at a continually varying market value; though, no doubt, as being more conveniently carried and kept, and more readily exchanged than most commodities, they are better fitted for taking the place of money. We have, however, had occasion to notice a lax usage by which such bonds and shares are often spoken of as "money;" but here, as was said, the notion of "invested" money seems to be always implied. In this fifth signification money is almost, as Mill says, a synonym for wealth, but yet not quite, for we do not apply the term to landed estates or pictures in a picture-gallery; we confine it, in fact, to wealth that is readily negotiable, and of which the current value is more or less definitely known.

It is now time to consider the second question originally raised, "What ought we to call money?" But I must hasten to say that I have no pretension to answer this dogmatically. I should be quite content to accept any of the denotations above given; or indeed, since there are undoubted disadvantages in rejecting any established

use of language, I am quite willing to adopt them all at once, and to change from one to the other according to the nature of the subject, provided only the change be clearly announced. What most concerns us is that we should not give weak reasons for adopting any particular denotation of the term; that we should not misapprehend the nature or importance of the characteristics by which we distinguish money from what is not money. Thus if we restrict the term, in the old way, to coined metal, we must at least not do so because metallic money alone has "intrinsic value;" since it is not the difference in the source of the value of coin, confusedly expressed by the word "intrinsic," which is practically important, but the difference in its range and permanence. It is not because coin is made of a more expensive material that it is a better money than notes; but because it could be used as a medium of exchange over a wider area, and because its value is not liable to sudden destruction through the insolvency of the issuer, nor to sudden diminution in consequence of excessive issues. And it should be borne in mind that these distinctions are not absolute; there is no reason why we should not have an international circulation of bank-notes; and the progress of science and industry might so enlarge the supply of gold as to make it easy for a wise and stable government to devise a paper currency of more durable value than gold coin would then be, if still issued as at present. So again, I have no objection to define money by the characteristic of being "legal tender;" provided we do not imagine that it is this legal tender alone that becomes "scarce" or "abundant," and consequently "cheap" or "dear," in what we shall still have to call the money market. Only in this case it will be well also to remember that the notes of the Bank of England, though in a certain sense "legal money," are not so in the sense most important to the political economist; since their legal currency would cease, if the Issue Department ceased to give gold for them, and therefore could hardly be effective in sustaining their value, if this ever came to be seriously doubted. No doubt the quality of these notes is unique; in the severest crisis they would be taken as readily as gold. But this is not due to the fact that they are legal tender, but to the special provision made for maintaining their convertibility; and perhaps even more to the general belief that the credit of the English Government is practically pledged to maintain it. And here again it must be observed that the unique position of the Bank of England has a practically equal effect in sustaining the currency of the liabilities of its banking department: in the worst of panics every one has considered "money deposited" with the Bank of England as safe as its bank-notes in his own strong chest.

Hence it seems to me that, in relation to English finance, the

definition of money that includes bank-notes generally, and excludes the rest of bankers' liabilities, is the least acceptable of all; since it ignores the profound distinction that separates the credit of the Bank of England from the credit of all other banks, while it unduly emphasizes the more superficial distinction between the liabilities of provincial banks that are transferred by notes and the liabilities of the London joint-stock banks that are transferred by cheques. No doubt there is actually an important difference between the working of the cheque-system and that of the note-system; since cheques do not circulate as notes do; the receiver of a cheque commonly pays it in without delay, and thus selects the banker whose liabilities he consents to take as money, whereas the receiver of a note usually exercises no such choice. But this is not the ground which I find most frequently given for drawing a broad line between notes and deposits; but rather such trivial reasons as that deposits cannot be "currency" because they do not pass "from hand to hand," as though the mere physical transmission were the important fact, and not the transfer of the ownership of bankers' liabilities.

Again, suppose we adopt the widest meaning of "money" which we have found to be current in Lombard Street, and include bankers' liabilities, whether represented by bank-notes or not, we shall still be excluding that other kind of "currency" of which the material is merchants' credit, represented by bills of exchange. We shall have, therefore, to bear in mind carefully that bills of exchange—so far as they still circulate among traders, and are not at once discounted—perform the main function of money, in being a medium for transferring commodities. And finally, for some purposes it would be convenient to extend the denotation of money still farther, and define it as any commonly accepted medium of exchange, so as to include bills of exchange, as the "paper money of commerce," as well as bullion, its metallic money. But if we do this we must not forget that what is most important to the buyer of commodities is, that the seller should take what he offers in exchange, and not that other people should take it. Now there are other valuable articles besides bills of exchange—as, for instance, Government bonds—which are more convenient for transmission than bullion; hence, if foreigners will take them in payment for the goods they have sold, as is now more and more the case, they will fulfil this important function of money better than the noblest metal. In short, whatever course we adopt, we shall find that definitions are not talismans for simplifying the complex relations of facts, but merely instruments by which, when we have thoroughly analysed any part of the complexity, we may fix in our thought some of the most important results of our analysis.

HENRY SIDGWICK.



## CONVENTIONS AT WHIST.

THE object of this article is, not to treat of whist generally, but to discuss some points in the modern game which involve questions of principle, and in regard to which there has been, and still is, difference of opinion among intelligent and thoughtful players.

No apology is needed for such a discussion when we consider the remarkable hold that whist takes on the attention of the most intellectual men. Saying nothing of ordinary domestic play, in which many well-educated persons take great pleasure, the London clubs furnish examples every day of the enthusiasm with which men of high culture devote themselves to the game. In a whist coterie at one of these institutions may be noticed cabinet ministers, ambassadors, peers, judges, magistrates, college professors, literary and scientific celebrities, statesmen, and others of public reputation, who engage in the game with an earnestness that shows it is not an idle pastime, but a mental exercise in which they find real attraction. To such persons any discussion which will throw light on doubtful principles cannot be unacceptable.

In order to explain the nature of the question to be treated of, it is necessary to say something of the manner in which a player obtains data for his guidance. At the commencement of the hand he knows nothing of the position of any cards except his own thirteen (and the turn-up, if he is not the dealer). But as the play goes on he begins to acquire information by the fall of the cards: every card that is played allows of some inference being drawn as to where other cards do or do not lie. Before the hand is half over there have been indications enough to disclose the general character of each hand, and very soon afterwards it may be said that every fact of consequence has been revealed. Hence the player in the first instance must be guided by such general rules as, according to calculation and long experience, are most likely to be favourable; but as the facts become developed, he must adapt his play to them, and take the utmost advantage of them possible. Deschappelles, the great French writer on whist, has a fanciful way of illustrating the progress of the play of a hand; he likens it to the parabolic path of a shell thrown from a mortar, the seventh trick forming the apex of the curve. During the first half, corresponding to the rise of the projectile, the play is tentative, and the player is acquiring information, which, in the latter or descending portion, he has to apply.<sup>1</sup>

(1) *Quarterly Review*, January, 1871, p. 65.

Now the data most important to obtain, early and correctly, are such as refer to the contents of the hand of the player's *partner*. It has been established that the most advantageous system is for a player not to consider his own hand alone, but to treat it in conjunction with that of his partner, and thus for the two to play what is called a *combined game*. This is the essence of modern whist, and it is the outcome of all the intelligence that has been applied to the game, and the experience gained in it, during the last hundred and twenty years. But in order to promote this mutual knowledge, between the partners, of each other's hands, it is, of course, essential that each of them must take every *legitimate* means in his power to give his partner information, and to disclose to him, as far as is practicable, what cards he holds. And this brings us to the question we propose to discuss, namely, how far is it legitimate for a player to go in giving his partner information? The discussion will chiefly be directed to what are called *conventions*—*i.e.* certain modes of play established by pre-concerted arrangement; and it may be as well to describe at once the case in regard to which the question has chiefly arisen.

In the combined game a player will often find it important to get trumps led promptly; and as it may not be in his power to get the lead so soon as he desires, a *conventional signal* was introduced about forty years ago, by which he could intimate his desire to his partner, and call on him to lead trumps at the first opportunity. It is done in a very simple way, namely, by playing unnecessarily a higher card before a lower, when the usual custom would require the lower one to be played first. Thus, suppose a king and ace are led consecutively, and my two lowest cards of that suit are the seven and the three, the usual custom requires me to throw away first the three and then the seven; but if I reverse this, and play first the seven and then the three, it is understood as a signal to my partner to lead trumps as soon as he can. This device, called the *signal for trumps*, or *asking for trumps*, is explained in the most modern works on whist, and it is adopted in the London clubs, but its legitimacy is not universally acknowledged. Many private whist circles refuse to admit it, and the French, among whom are many very good players, ignore it altogether, as not being lawful play. The objectors to it consider it no more justifiable than giving a sign with your finger, or kicking your partner under the table. The ordinary writers on whist content themselves with describing the signal as orthodox play; I only know two places in which any attempt to justify it or to discuss its legality has been made. These are in the well-known Treatise on Short Whist, 1864, by the late Mr. James Clay, M.P., one of the best players of modern times, and in an article on Modern Whist, in the *Quarterly Review* for

January, 1871. Both writers approve the signal, but I do not think they have exhausted the discussion.

Our first step in the matter, before we approach the debateable ground of the signal itself, must be to define somewhat in detail what are the clearly justifiable modes by which information between the partners may be conveyed. We shall then see how far the trump signal is analogous to them, and in what respect it differs from them.

1. The simplest and by far the most comprehensive mode of conveying information to an intelligent partner is by following carefully, at the commencement of the hand, the rules which have been established as most expedient on general grounds. It has been proved by long experience, aided by calculation and reasoning, that certain modes of play (which are fully laid down in the books) are likely to be the most favourable for trick-making; and if these are implicitly adhered to, an intelligent player cannot fail to draw abundant inferences from them. For example, if my partner's first lead is a trump, I infer he is strong in them and wants them drawn; if he begins with a plain suit, I infer that suit is his longest or best; if he leads the king, I know he has also ace or queen; if he leads the ace, followed by the queen, I know he holds also the knave; if he forces me, I know he is strong in trumps; if he ruffs a doubtful trick, I infer he is weak in trumps. I also notice his discard, and infer that is from his weakest suit; when he plays a losing card of any suit, I know it is the lowest he has of that suit—and so on. Such rules—and they exist in great number and variety—are matters of ordinary expediency, which all well-instructed players are bound to know and to adhere to. In the modern game they are much more clearly defined, more decided in their nature, and less liable to exception than was formerly the case, and no doubt one cause that has brought this about has been the desire to make the intimations they convey to the partner clear and unmistakable. Still, however, as their primary object is to conduce to trick-making, no question can arise as to the legality of the communications they imply.

2. But cases frequently arise where the motive of expediency does not apply, it being immaterial, for the object of trick-making, what card should be played. These cases have to be provided for, and a few examples will explain their nature and the mode of dealing with them. Suppose a king is led and I hold the ten and the four of the suit; it is reasonable and proper that I should throw away the card of least value, *i.e.* the *four*, and not the ten, as the latter may be of use hereafter. My partner, knowing this rule, will properly infer that the card I throw away is the lowest I have. But suppose I hold the *five* and the *four*, both of equal value, so that it is

immaterial on grounds of general expediency which I play. What am I to do? May I throw away which I please? or should I adopt any rule in the matter? The answer is dictated by common sense. It would be most inexpedient that I should have the power of exercising caprice, sometimes doing one thing and sometimes another, which would puzzle my partner and prevent his drawing any trustworthy inferences from my play. My natural course is therefore to adopt a *uniform rule*, and this rule clearly should be to follow the analogy of the former case, where the cards were wider apart, *i.e.* to throw away the *lowest* card, the four, and not the five. This practice, therefore, is established as obligatory.

Now it is customary to call this a *convention*, made for the purpose of conveying information to the partner; and as its legality cannot be disputed, it is quoted as a precedent for conventions generally, of all kinds.<sup>1</sup> But, though it undoubtedly admits, to a certain extent, of this description, the convention has a limitation which is of high importance, inasmuch as it is not a *mutual* one; it is addressed only to the person who has to *play* the cards, and not to the partner who has to *observe* the play and draw inferences from it. Its very object is to do away with the necessity of any special understanding on the part of the latter, as it enables him to act with confidence on the means of inference arising from the ordinary rules.

The same principle applies also to cases where the cards are not losing cards thrown away, but are valuable ones, played for the purpose of winning the trick. Suppose I am fourth player, and hold the king, queen, and ten, the eight being in the trick against me: it is of course reasonable and proper I should *win with the lowest card possible*, that is, the ten. But suppose my cards are queen, knave, and ten, all three of equal value, which should I play? Here the convention, if such it may be called, says I must play the ten, to preserve the analogy with the former case, and to empower my partner to draw the same inference, namely, that I have won with the lowest card possible. He will be certain, in both cases, that I cannot hold the nine. Hence the convention is expressed by a general rule that in sequences (except in *leading* them, when other considerations come in) the *lowest* must always be played.

There is yet another application of the same principle. It is a rule of general expediency that in returning my partner's lead, if I have only two of the suit left, say the knave and the six, I must return the highest of them, in order to strengthen his hand and to give him the chance of a finesse. It follows that he, knowing this rule, will infer, after seeing the third round, that I have no more.

(1) In a well-known little book upon whist, written by me many years ago, I adopted this view, in common with writers of far higher authority than myself. But more mature consideration has led me to modify my opinion.

But suppose I hold, say, the seven and the six; it is of no importance, in regard to the above-named objects, which I play, but the convention tells me I must adhere to the analogy of the former case, and return the *seven*, in order that his inference may be correctly maintained.

It is essential to insist on the fact that in all these cases the convention is of the same one-sided kind. It says to me, the player, "Whenever you hold cards the playing of which is indifferent on general grounds, you must not act capriciously and irregularly, which would perplex and confuse your partner; you must make your play conform to the usual rules, in order that he may draw the usual inferences." But to my partner, the observer, the convention is altogether silent. The ordinary inferences suffice for his purpose, and he is left to draw them undisturbed. He has no occasion to trouble himself whether I hold sequences or not; in any case the card I play tells him what he wants to know.

With this supplementary provision, the rules of general expediency furnish an abundant and altogether unimpeachable source of information to the partner, and if both parties are skilful and attentive they may obtain almost as perfect an insight into each other's hands as if their cards were exposed. They hold, in fact, what is termed whist "conversation," and to facilitate this the rules for systematic regularity of play are imperative: a player who violates them without sufficient reason is said to play "false," or not to understand the "language of the game."

3. But these rules are sometimes intentionally violated; a player may depart from them for several motives, and, among others, he may play irregularly with the special object of conveying information to his partner. For it is easy to conceive cases where cards played in an unexpected and abnormal way may imply something which it is desirable for the partner to know.

Examples of this are given by the oldest authorities on whist, Hoyle and Mathews. Hoyle says, "If you have ace, king, and queen of trumps, play the lowest [which would not be right with ordinary suits], in order to let your partner into the state of your game." Also he tells you that if you have a quart-major in any suit, and have occasion to throw away from it, you should throw away, abnormally, the highest, for the same object. Mathews says, if you have to win a small trump with one of a sequence of three, win it, irregularly, with the highest, and play the lowest afterwards, "to inform your partner." The common practice of leading the king first, from ace and king, comes really within this category; it is an irregularity which is perfectly intelligible without any explanation. These, or any other manœuvres of the same kind, are obviously lawful. So long as a player follows suit, he may use his own discretion as to how he plays, and if he at any time conceives an unusual

contrivance from which he thinks an observant partner may draw some useful inference, his right to adopt it is beyond question. But in these cases there is *no convention*, no previously concerted understanding; the act of play tells its own tale, conveys fully its own meaning, and the partner, though he may never have heard of it before, is supposed, by his own intelligence, to draw from it the inference intended. If it be said that, inasmuch as some of these things are described in books, they become equivalent to conventions, I answer that if they are so they are at any rate only one-sided conventions like those last described. To me, the player, they say, "Here are certain irregular practices which you may use to make your partner understand certain things;" but to my partner, the observer, the conventions are unnecessary: all he needs is the innocent advice, "When you see your partner do something irregular, it will probably convey some information on the face of it; try and find out what it means, and act accordingly."

Under these three heads may be included all the ordinary ways of communicating intelligence between the partners. They are all sanctioned by the oldest authorities, and contain nothing repugnant to the spirit of the game. They amount simply to this: either my partner, assuming that I shall follow carefully the established rules, will draw the usual inferences from my play, or, if he sees me play erratically, he will infer by his own unaided intelligence what this erratic play is likely to mean. But in no case is there any pre-arranged understanding, telling him that if I play in a certain irregular way, he is to infer therefrom *something which his own intelligence would not enable him to discover*.

We are now in a position to examine the signal for trumps, and compare it with the above-mentioned ways of conveying information. We will refer to the example of it already given, and suppose that to king and ace of some suit led, I throw away first the seven and then the three. Now putting any pre-arranged understanding aside, what is my partner to make of this play? In the first place it is highly irregular, and he can make nothing of it by the ordinary rules of expediency. But is it an irregularity of a nature to carry with it any definite meaning? Is it such a manœuvre as is described in our third category, which my partner can interpret by his own intelligence? Surely not. We may safely defy any rational person to infer, unprompted, from such an act that I want a trump to be led. Hence something further becomes necessary, this something being a pre-arranged understanding with my partner that a certain meaning, otherwise undecipherable, is to be attached to this mode of play. And this, it seems to me, is a whist novelty, having no precedent in any other recognised principle.

It is, however, only fair to see how the practice has been defended. Mr. Clay explains its origin, and endeavours thereby to show that,

supposing no convention or understanding to exist, the signal would arise in the course of natural play. The following examples will illustrate Mr. Clay's proposition :—

*a.* Suppose I have a very strong hand of trumps, which are hearts ; a strong suit of spades ; a queen and one small club ; and a knave and one small diamond. My adversary leads the king of clubs, to which I throw away the queen, in order to induce him to lead a trump. If he is an inexperienced player, he will very likely be tempted to do this ; but if he is cautious and does not fall into the trap, he will continue with his ace, to which I must then play my small card. Then comes the rôle of my partner ; he has, if observant, seen this manœuvre, and, if he is a good player, he will divine what was my object in playing the high card before the lower one, and will do for me, the first opportunity, that from which my enemy had wisely abstained.

*b.* Suppose it is my right-hand adversary's lead, and that he begins by leading a small diamond. I, having knave and a small one, ought, according to the established rule, to play the latter ; but, as I wish to get the lead, I depart from this rule and play the knave, hoping that the third player may have no bigger card in his hand. Suppose this does not succeed, but that the third player wins the trick and returns the suit ; my partner then, seeing my small card fall, will ask himself what could be my motive for playing irregularly ? and, if he is a good player, he can have little difficulty in guessing it, and will lead me a trump as soon as he can.

*c.* Suppose this time it is my partner's lead, and that he has ace and king of clubs, and ace and king of diamonds. He leads his two kings successively, to show me his strength, and to these I throw away the queen and the knave, instead of the small cards. He will then reason that my hand must be all, or nearly all, trumps and spades ; or at any rate he will conclude (which is the fact) that I *wish him to think so*, and thereby to induce him to lead a trump, as obviously the best thing for both.

Now, in each of these cases, a high card is played, contrary to the established usage, before a low one of the same suit, with the object of procuring a trump lead ; and, therefore, so far as it goes, the play corresponds with the trump-signal. And each case is clearly legitimate, for they all come within the category of irregular acts conveying their own explanation. But, it will be observed, there is *here no convention*, or previous understanding of any kind ; my action takes place solely according to my own design, and its interpretation is effected solely by my partner's own unprompted intelligence and penetrative skill. Hence there is a long step between these cases and the present form of the signal, in which, *by a previous understanding with my partner*, the principle is extended to interpret (what would be otherwise unintelligible) the irregular play of any two

cards whatever. And it is precisely this step that throws doubt on its legality.

Mr. Clay, with I fancy a little misgiving on this point, dismisses it very shortly; he says, after describing the origin of the signal (the italics are mine) :—

“This method of play being as old as whist itself, *it was certain sooner or later to be reduced to the conventional sign, good in the lowest cards as well as in the highest.* Asking for trumps is then a conventional sign, *like any other*, neither more nor less, open to no objection on the score of unfairness.”

This looks very like begging the whole question. The fact that skilful players adopt irregular manœuvres for particular objects does not justify the establishment of a new kind of convention to generalise them; and after the explanations we have given, we may safely demur to Mr. Clay's assumption that the sign is “like any other.” The difference between it and any other is the very reason why it is objected to. The defence of the *Quarterly Review* is as follows :—

“We cannot see that it [the signal for trumps] is a whit more open to cavil than playing the lowest of a sequence, or any other preconcerted means of conveying information. It has been attempted to draw a distinction between purely empirical conventions, and such as may be traced to an extension of the ordinary rules of play. But we do not see any legitimate ground for such a distinction; for whenever a natural mode of play is pushed so far as *to require a special understanding to make it intelligible*, it becomes as strictly conventional as if it were of empirical origin.”

The defect of this argument is, that it hardly takes a sufficiently comprehensive view of the real nature of justifiable conventions, and of the essential difference between them and the signal in question. It has already been sufficiently shown that there is no other mode of conveying information which “requires a special understanding to make it intelligible;” the trump-signal being, in this respect, quite new. The exceptional nature of the convention is testified to by the question so often asked when strangers sit down together, “Do you use the trump-signal?” Nobody ever thinks of asking such a question in regard to any other point, the reason obviously being that ordinary play needs no explanation, whereas for this exceptional novelty a pre-arranged understanding is indispensable.

We may ask, then, is this novel sort of convention in accordance with the spirit of legitimate whist? We are bound to consider the game, not in the light of a means of gambling (for which anything would be legitimate that the parties might agree on), but as an intellectual exercise, and there can be little doubt, I think, that to keep up its character in this respect it is imperative that each player should draw his inferences from the fall of the cards according to the dictates of his own judgment, without any prompting or suggestion. Indeed, this may be gathered from the very name. The word “whist” is defined by an old authority as *interjectio silentium*



*imperans*; and Cotton (1674) says the game "is called whist from the silence that is to be observed in the play." What then does this "silence" refer to? Not simply to the absence of noise, as distracting the attention. I would rather believe that it is intended to forbid any kind of remark or communication which shall convey irregular information. It is not an unreasonable extension of this principle to forbid such communications *before* as well as *during* the play; and this would apply to any pre-arranged signal. The true spirit of the game is well expressed in an old Spanish proverb:—

" Quo hablen cartas  
Y callen barbas."

" Let the cards discourse, but the lips be mute."

This view is corroborated by the precedent of the older authorities. I cannot find a vestige of any previous understanding with the partner in either Hoyle or Mathews. Both of them repeatedly recommend you "to inform your partner," or "to let your partner into the state of your game;" but this is always to be done by some mode of play which tells its own story, and requires no convention to make it intelligible.<sup>1</sup> It may be said that the authority of such a man as Mr. Clay is sufficient to warrant the introduction of a new principle under the altered circumstances of the modern game, and no doubt the greatest respect is due to his matured opinions. But it must be recollected that he has, with thoughtful and praiseworthy candour, given in this case a full statement of his reasons, and has thereby invited examination of the logic on which they are founded.

It appears to me that Mr. Clay's arguments may be done full justice to, and may at the same time be reconciled with what is here held to be the legitimate constitution of the game, by some such view as the following:—In modern whist an early lead of trumps is so extremely important to a player who is strong in them, that he must be expected to use every available means to procure it, and he is perfectly justified in adopting any contrivances which may either tempt the adversary to lead them; or may get the lead early into his own hands; or may show the need of a trump lead to his partner. And his partner ought to be *always on the watch for such contrivances*, and ready to respond to them in the way desired. But these contrivances ought to be confined to such as are clearly intelligible *per se*, and there should be no convention as to an artificial interpretation of acts, such as the irregular play of useless cards, which can have no object except to convey an empirical signal. By such a limitation, while great scope would be given for

(1) The only seeming exception is where Mathews says, "If your partner calls [for honours in the long game] before his turn, he means you should play a trump." Mathews, however, cannot be supposed to sanction this sort of thing, which would, if often done, cause the player to be turned out of any decent society. It is clear by other passages that whist morality was not very high in those days.

skill, on the part both of the player and the observer, the ethics of the game would be maintained pure.

The only semblance of an argument I can conceive in support of the natural origin of the signal in its present form is something as follows:—Suppose I am, as above stated, very desirous to get trumps led; I may say to myself, “My partner is on the watch for anything I may do indicating my desire for a trump lead; and for this purpose he will particularly notice my play of *high cards*. For this reason I will stimulate his observation by throwing away high cards before low ones whenever I can, even though there may be no other particular object in doing so, under the hope that he may divine therefrom the object I have in view.” If this were a *bonâ-fide* impromptu proceeding nothing could be said against it, as it would still fall within the category of erratic play, bearing its own interpretation; it is only effecting this interpretation by a pre-arranged convention that changes its character, and assimilates it to signals of a class that everybody would condemn.

We have hitherto confined attention to the call for trumps, but in consequence of the success of this, other conventional modes of play have lately been introduced. It will be well briefly to notice some of them, and the principles above laid down will serve to test their legitimacy. In order to judge whether any proposed new device is admissible or not, we have only to ask two questions. Is it expedient on trick-winning grounds? Or if not, is it a device which conveys on the face of it its own design, without the necessity of a previous understanding? If either of these can be answered in the affirmative, the device is legitimate; if not, it is objectionable.

A new conventional mode of play, lately proposed by the eminent whist writer “Cavendish,” and received with favour in some circles, is *leading the lowest card but one*, instead of the lowest, from a suit of five or more. This is often useful in enabling a careful observer to “count his partner’s hand;” and the author justifies it in this way. He says, “If I hold, say, king, 10, 9, 8, and 2, I ought, on principles of general expediency, to lead the 8, in order to prevent the trick from being won by a very small card; and by analogy I may extend the principle to the case where I hold king, 10, 9, 8, and 7.” The test question for this is, Could the partner, in the latter case, infer that the player held more than four cards, without the aid of the previous understanding? I am inclined to think not, and if so the convention stands on the same ground as the trump-signal.

Another novelty, though not so generally known, is a variation in the manner of leading ace and king from a short suit. With four, or more, the rule is to begin with the king; but according to this variation, the player begins with the ace, in order, by the convention, to disclose the shortness of the suit to his partner. The

justification for this is, that in leading from suits of two or three it is generally expedient to begin with the highest, and the contrivance in question is an application of the same rule. Here, again, the question is, Would the partner understand it without the aid of any convention? I think this is more possible than in the last case; for, noticing the irregularity, he might fairly *guess*, without prompting, that the player was adopting the usual well-known practice in a short suit; but still the question is open to doubt.

A third modern proposal, and one of much interest, is a revival of an old rule in respect of the *discard*. The usual practice in the modern game is to discard from your *weakest suit*, and so essential is this that Mr. Clay recommends that it should be adopted even at the cost of unguarding an honour. The new proposal is to reverse the rule, by discarding from your *strong* suit in the case where trumps are led by the adversary. The justification of this is given by Mathews (Bath edition, 1832, p. 20), who says:—

“Take every opportunity to show your partner that you can command the trumps. In this case he will keep his own strong suit entire; whereas, *if the strength of trumps is with the adversaries*, his play would be to *keep guard on their [strong] suits, and throw away from his own.*”

This is a most reasonable and proper rule, and it is a wonder it has ever been disused; for if I have, say, a king single guarded, or a queen double guarded, of suits in which the adversaries are strong, it would be folly to throw away the chance of making a trick in them (and so, perhaps, saving the game), for the sake of preserving intact my own strong suit, which, the adversaries being strong in trumps, I have no chance of bringing in. But, it must be observed, there is *no convention* in this case; it is simply a rule of trick-making expediency, and if the partner knows it, as he ought, he cannot fail to understand the play, just as he would any of those included in our first category of legitimate intimations.

We cannot, of course, ignore the fact that, although these additional novelties have been looked coldly upon, the chief and most important one, the trump-signal, has been very widely received; so widely, indeed, that it would be hopeless now to engage in a crusade against it. But still, as we remarked at the outset, its reception is not universal; there are many good authorities who disapprove it, and refuse to adopt it, and if the arguments here brought forward are sound, they have reason on their side. And I think good grounds may be shown why the objection should be rather encouraged than opposed.

In the first place, the introduction of arbitrary pre-arranged signals between partners is a dangerous precedent; it might possibly be the thin end of a wedge of unforeseen length and power. Who can tell where such signals would stop? We have seen that they have already begun to multiply, and where is the line to be drawn?

If they become common, there would seem no reason why they should be confined to their present form. Mr. Clay draws a distinction between indications by the cards themselves and indications by the manner of playing them; but this is hardly tenable. When a player says to his partner, "If, holding two useless cards, I throw away the highest first, I want you to lead trumps," what is the essential difference between this and his saying, "If, in playing two cards, I throw the first sharply on the table, and lay the second down softly, I want you to do so and so?" And what would the noble game of whist then come to? Yet the signal for trumps is an introduction of the principle.

Secondly. The signal for trumps damages the character of the game. It is one of the finest features of whist that it requires the player to exercise his observation and his reasoning powers to the utmost, in order to infer the state of the various hands from the legitimate fall of the cards; and this is, of course, checked by any direct intimations. Mr. Clay fully admits this. He says:—

"Asking for trumps has simplified the game to the indifferent player and greatly diminished the advantage of skill. The time for leading trumps used to be the point, of all others, demanding the greatest judgment. Now, almost as often as not, the tiro knows whether his partner wishes trumps to be played. So much is this the case, that a player of great reputation, who claims such credit as may be due to the invention of this signal, has often said that he bitterly repented his ingenuity, which has deprived him of one-half the advantage which he derived from his superior play."

Thirdly. These signals vastly increase the inequality, in point of success, between the careful, observant players, who attend to them, and the careless, unobservant ones, who do not, giving the former a power over the latter which, when the play is high, is not always of a wholesome character. Public attention was directed a few years ago to large losses at whist by young men with more money than brains, who were infatuated enough to play for high stakes with players of much superior skill. It has been said that whist is not suitable for gambling, but it is surely as easy to bet a hundred pounds on a rubber as to stake it on the red or black at Monte Carlo; while if high points be played, there is (which there is *not* at Monte Carlo) the additional certainty of heavy losses against superior skill. Hence high whist may be even more dangerous to the inexperienced *jeunesse dorée* than the regulated public gambling which has excited so much condemnation. This danger the new signals largely enhance. One cannot say that the use of acknowledged conventions to the disadvantage of inferior players can be stigmatised as unfair; but if there is any doubt as to their being consistent with the proper spirit of the game, the objection to them becomes cogent in a social as well as in an intellectual point of view.

WILLIAM POLE.

## BLACK AND WHITE IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.<sup>1</sup>

### THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

THE population of the principal Southern States may be roughly stated to be about half black and half white, that is, putting aside Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, and such intermediate States. Of the first-mentioned States the blacks are in a considerable majority in South Carolina and one or two more; in the others the whites are somewhat more numerous. Before the war the blacks were almost all slaves. I think the idea prevalent in Europe was that the Southern whites were composed of an aristocracy of slave-owning gentlemen refined and polished, with their dependent slave-drivers, and a large number of very inferior whites known as "mean whites," "white trash," and so on, who were rather an encumbrance than otherwise. It seems to me that this view is not justified. The population was very much divided geographically; there was the great black belt on the lower lands, where a few whites ruled over a large slave population; and there was a broad upper belt in the hilly country, where the great bulk of the population was white, mostly small farmers owning their land. No doubt education was much more backward in the South than in the North, and the people were probably less pushing; but I have been very favourably impressed by these Southern whites, many of whom are of Scotch-Irish (*i.e.* Northern Presbyterian Irish), or Highland Scotch blood; they seemed to be a handsome, steady, industrious people; and if somewhat primitive in their ways, and humble in the character of their houses and belongings, they are curiously self-supporting and independent of the outer world; they raise their own food, and to this day their wives weave their clothes from their own wool and cotton; and, if not rich, they have few wants. There is no doubt in all these Southern States a large intermediate zone in which white and black are much intermixed; but even there they are a good deal aggregated in patchwork fashion, the general rule apparently being that the rich slave-owners have occupied the best lands, and the poorer independent whites the poorer lands, especially much of what are called "pine barrens," though they are not so barren after all. A notable population in this latter country is the settlement of Scotch Highlanders who came over after the '45, Flora Macdonald being one of them. I am told that not only do they speak Gaelic to this day, but the few black slaves they had

(1) Concluded from the *Fortnightly Review* for March.

among them spoke Gaelic too. In truth, then, I believe that the population of very inferior whites without property never was very large. There were very many without slave property, but most had more or less land. The chief justification for attributing lowness and meanness to the poorer whites seems to be, that some of the inferior central tracts are occupied by a set of people said to be descended from the convicts sent out in former days, and to this day very unthrifty. They are called Sandhillers in South Carolina, and did seem to be an inferior people.

The changes favouring small farmers have tended to improve on the whole the condition of those Southern whites who have any sort of property, the losses of the war and the bad times notwithstanding; but mere labourers, probably, feel the competition of free black labour more than formerly. I saw at places black and white labourers working together at the same work, and on the same wages, in a way which, to our Indian ideas of the dignity of the white race, is somewhat distressing. But I did not detect anything specially bad or degraded about these whites; and in the Southern cotton mills (very prosperous and growing establishments), where the whites have a monopoly of the employment, they are very good workers, the women especially being, apparently, as good as anywhere—the men not so good.

The real weakness of the Southern party during the war was neither any want of gallantry on the part of the slave-owning classes, nor any active disaffection on the part of the blacks, but the entire want of sympathy for and zeal in the war on the part of the majority of the white population owning no slaves, who considered it a slave-owners' war for the maintenance of slavery. It is surprising to find how many, even of the upper classes, say that they were against secession and war, and only "went with their State" when war was inevitable; but having gone into it, the whole of that class, and all connected with them—professional men, doctors, lawyers, and every one else—went into it with a will, and sustained losses such as, perhaps, no civilised people ever bore before. So long as they were successful there was little active opposition by the poorer whites; but the conscription and other burdens to support a slave-owners' war became very severe, the whites not interested in that cause became recalcitrant, some went into active opposition; and at last it was more desertion and disunion than anything else that brought about the final overthrow.

After the war the results of the victory were summed in the three famous amendments to the constitution known as the 13th, 14th, and 15th, comprising the abolition of slavery, equal privileges for all citizens, and the "right of all citizens to vote not to be denied or abridged in any State on account of race, colour, or previous con-

dition of servitude." The great struggle was over this last, or 15th amendment, and it was only enforced on the Southern States by extreme compulsion. That is in fact still the bone of contention. At the first election under the new constitution many of the whites were still under political disabilities on account of rebellion, and in several States the leaders of the lately rebellious whites deliberately counselled abstinence from political affairs as a sort of protest. Consequently, in most places, the black vote, under the guidance of the Northern politicians known as Carpet-baggers, carried the day entirely. The result was that a very large number of ignorant Negroes were sent to the State Legislatures, and many of the Carpet-baggers being corrupt adventurers, there was much corruption and scandal. This has brought about a union among the Southern whites, for those who were unwilling to fight for slavery are by no means willing to be ruled by the blacks, or even very freely to admit their equality; and so it has happened that parties in the South are ranged into black and white much more than ever they were before.

In most States the white leaders soon came to their senses, and perceived, what might have been seen from the first, that a population which had half the numbers, and all the property, influence, and education, must prevail over the black half possessed of none of these advantages, and in many respects dependent on the propertied classes. They therefore very early returned to the electoral charge, and by no very unfair means regained possession of most of the State Governments and the control of the State Legislatures. Fortunately, taught by adversity, the white leaders so restored to power took a reasonable and moderate course, honestly accepting the situation and the great constitutional amendments. In these States it is a great gain that, in order to introduce certain amendments of a moderate character, the people, under white leadership, have recently passed revised editions of their State constitutions (embodying the war amendments), which no one can gainsay as not being real and voluntary; whereas the first constitutions imposed after the war were certainly the work of very one-sided conventions, acting under the protection of United States bayonets. Besides the management of their own States, the white party have been more and more gaining the great majority of the Southern seats in the United States Congress, and things have been more and more tending to that democratic "Solid South" of which we have lately heard so much. In some of the States this was inevitable, and I doubt if it can be said that in most cases any very unfair means have been used to great excess. When I left the States, several of the recent elections were still disputed; but I believe there is no doubt that in Virginia and North Carolina two or three Republican members have

been returned for the districts in which the black vote is in a very overwhelming majority, which is probably as much as could be expected under the circumstances. In Georgia no Republican Congressmen were elected; but several "independent" Democrats have been returned under circumstances which tend much to insure fair dealing towards the blacks, inasmuch as, the whites being divided, the black vote has been important. The Independents justify their separation from the regulars of their party by denouncing the evils and jobbery of the "caucus" system; and they go on to say that it was a sort of bargain with the blacks that if they quietly yielded the reins of power to the whites, they should be fairly treated, and their right to vote should be honestly recognised; whereas if the whole thing is settled in white caucus, from which the blacks are excluded, they are practically disfranchised.

As regards, then, what I may call the moderate States, I see no ground for taking a gloomy view of the situation. Perhaps as a foreigner writing on the other side of the Atlantic I may be permitted to say (what might, if I were nearer, seem presumptuous) that the men who, in these States, as governors now wield the large powers intrusted to the executive in America, seemed to me very able, sound, moderate men, from whose judgment and discretion I should expect much benefit. My only doubt is as regards one constitutional amendment which most of these States have adopted. I do not seriously quarrel with that which, as with us, deprives of the franchise those who have not paid their taxes. But it must be fairly worked. There is generally a direct poll tax, justified by its application to popular education of which the masses are so much in need; and there is a question of a tax on dogs, the slaves of the ex-slaves. If any luxury is shown in the collection of taxes from poor and ignorant people about election time, or the date of payment is put near election day, very many may be disfranchised, who must soon pay the money nevertheless. The provision in the new constitution which I most fear is that which permanently disfranchises all who are convicted of crime, unless the governor remits the sentence. In principle exception can hardly be taken to this; but I have some doubt whether, in the matter of justice, the Negroes are quite secure of fair play; and it is somewhat dangerous if a nearly balanced constituency may be affected by a rigorous administration of the criminal laws. It is certain that the prison populations are composed of blacks in a proportion greater than the general population to an overwhelming degree. Whatever the degree of their criminality, there is a disposition to cure it by a strictness in penal management which requires watching, seeing how much the administration of justice is now in the hands of the whites. The



magistrates and judges are either elected or nominated by the white rulers. English law is the basis of most American institutions, and the English law regulating the selection of juries has always been very lax. I found that in the Southern States there is little regard to the principle of selecting *de medietate lingue* in cases between black and white. Very few blacks are admitted on juries; in Virginia, I believe, none at all.

Then as regards punishment, flogging is very freely used in Virginia; but further South the system of *chain-gangs*, i.e. *extra-mural* labour, is universal. The convicts are not only employed on public works, railways, and the like, but are very usually let out to private speculators, and they are made a source of profit instead of an expense. It comes simply to this, that the punishment for crime is reduction to the old state of slavery in a form not very widely differing from the old form. I am told that the people most often convicted and sent to the chain-gang are the undisciplined young Negroes who have grown up since the days of slavery. I have even heard it said by reliable men that they employ no man so readily as one who has come out of the chain-gang, because he has there learnt discipline.

In nothing have I encountered greater discrepancies of statement than in regard to the criminality of Negroes. Many people represent them as most inveterate thieves, whom nothing but severity will reform. Others say they have lived among them for years and never had occasion to lock a door; and of this last I have had personal experience. I tried very hard to sift the truth, and I believe it to be this. The Negro is not much given to violent, and very little to what I may call vicious, crime. In this respect he really stands above most other races. But he has brought from slavery times a sort of childish want of respect for property in certain things. It is hardly deemed a theft, but only a misconduct, when a child is caught taking a spoonful of jam. A slave used, it was said, to reason thus. "I am my master's, so is this chicken. If I catch and eat the chicken, I take nothing from my master." These things depended much on individual management. So it is now; in well-managed establishments and on well-administered estates things go on smoothly enough, but in many places there is a good deal of disposition to petty picking and stealing which needs to be checked by moderate measures. I gather, however, that some things thought very venial in slave times are now severely dealt with. On the whole I am inclined to think that there is some foundation for the assertion sometimes put forward by friends of the blacks, that a much harder justice is dealt to one class than to another; that for all the outrages and murders committed by the whites in the troubled years after the war, very little condign punishment has been executed, while justice and something more is done on the

blacks. One thing did astonish me during my tour, and that is, to find how much Judge Lynch survives, especially when the accused are blacks. I imagined he was a thing of the past, but I found that several lynching cases of great atrocity occurred before I had been many weeks in the States; that is, hanging by popular movement without the intervention of judge and jury. This is generally the case when there is any alleged assault of any kind by a black on a white woman. The blacks are popularly said to be prone to that kind of crime; with what justice I cannot say. An experienced judge told me he had known many accused and many hanged, but none convicted on trial. The mere suggestion that a black man would like to do something of the kind if he could, seems enough to hang him.

Hitherto I have principally spoken of those States which I have called moderate, but there are two or three others where moderate counsels have not prevailed, and where the difficulties are much greater. Happily they are but a small minority. My personal inquiries were limited to South Carolina; but, known as it is as the "*petrel State*," there is probably no more typical instance of the difficulties of reconstruction. So I shall confine myself to stating the case as I have gathered it in connection with that State.

Partly owing to the greater numerical preponderance of the blacks, and partly to the less disposition of the whites to accept measures of moderation and compromise, the black predominance in the Legislature and the Carpet-bag rule were carried farther and lasted much longer in South Carolina than in the surrounding States. The great majority of the legislators were blacks, and though some of them were fair representative men with some education, no doubt most of them were absurdly ignorant and out of place, and there was some colour for the nickname of "the Monkey House," which their enemies applied to the Assembly. They, however, indulged in no violent class-legislation, but were very completely guided by the white men who had obtained the government—principally Northern Carpet-baggers. Whatever violence and disturbance there was (and there was a good deal), was not on the part of the black majority, but of the white minority, who, instead of trying constitutional methods to regain power, preferred Ku Klux organizations and such violent methods, committing many murders and creating much terror. The strong arm of the United States authority was, however, used to aid in putting down the Ku Klux, and by the time the elections of 1876 approached the whites had begun to see that with two-fifths of the population and all the property, and much physical and moral force, it was easier to win elections than to continue the contest by unconstitutional means. Accordingly, in 1876 the whites got the best of it in the elections for the State Legislature, though

three black men were still sent to Congress. As regards the very important question of the election of State Governor and the consequent control of the executive, the election was disputed between Chamberlain, the former Carpet-bag Governor, and Wade Hampton, the very popular Democrat, who was put up on moderate and compromise principles, and from whose moderation and conciliation much was expected. As we know in regard to a more important election and subordinate issues arising out of it, there is an extreme difficulty in deciding disputes of this kind in the United States. On this occasion no mode of settlement was arrived at, and in the beginning of 1877 two rival governments were for months actually face to face, each claiming to exercise the executive function. That the question was not settled by an appeal to arms was due partly to a certain forbearance, and partly to the presence of United States troops; but these latter were powerless to settle the matter, and a good deal of disturbance took place under their noses which they could not put a stop to. It was at this time that President Hayes decided to withdraw the garrisons which had hitherto been posted in the Southern States, and to give the moderate Southern politicians, who had everywhere come to the front, a fair chance of carrying out in good faith the constitutional amendments, and bringing about a moral and political instead of a mere military restoration of the Union. He was probably well aware that the result must be to restore the Southern Democrats to power, and deliberately preferred to let South Carolina pass under the government of the moderate Wade Hampton, rather than abet a continuance of the struggle. Certainly that was the immediate effect of the withdrawal of the troops. I believe the question never was formally decided at all; but as soon as the United States troops went, the Democrats being evidently the strongest physically, the other party collapsed, and Wade Hampton quietly assumed the government without further dispute.

It is marvellous, under the circumstances, that there has been so little of armed collision in the Southern States; for, after all, the so-called United States garrisons were mere detachments at a few places, carrying with them the moral power of the United States Government, but nothing more. Very many of the blacks were armed and taught to fight during the war. There has been no attempt at any general disarmament of the Southern States; on the contrary, the Constitution insures to all citizens the right to possess arms, and all are entitled to serve, if they will, in the National Militia of each State. At one time arms were very freely distributed, and very large numbers of the blacks belonged to the popular military force which it was sought to establish under the name of "National Guards;" but the regiments so

formed were very ragged and irregular indeed, and on the ground (fairly enough established) of total inefficiency their arms were taken from them, and the State-armed Militia was confined to the companies which came up to a moderate standard of efficiency—a practice consonant enough with that of other States of the Union.

The Negroes have a good deal of military zeal, and in many of the larger towns they have very creditable Volunteer Militia Companies, sometimes, I am told, a good deal better drilled and more efficient than the white companies; but they are required to provide their own uniforms and incur expenses which the rural Negroes cannot afford. And so it happens that the black militia are, on the whole, small in number compared with the whites. Moreover, in some States, and South Carolina is one of them, the whites have rifle-clubs, outside and beyond the recognised and inspected militia, which constitute, in fact, a sort of armed political organization. Between militia and rifle-clubs and volunteer artillery they can always make a show of armed force, and indulge in an amount of cannon-firing and so on, which is not encouraging to opponents of weak nerves.

For much that was done in troubled times, and much that has been done since (to which I shall come presently), the excuse is that the Carpet-bag rule was so utterly detestable, wicked, and impossible that it was an absolute necessity to get rid of it by fair means or foul. I have then sought to learn what are the terrible things suffered under this rule. There seemed to be a general agreement that very great abuses did exist under it, and before I went South I certainly expected to find that the Southern States had been for a time a sort of Pandemonium in which a white man could hardly live. Yet it certainly was not so. I have said that the Republican State Governments made no attack on the rights of property, and I have been able to discuss the whole labour and land question without having occasion to allude to political events as a very disturbing influence. It is in truth marvellous how well the parties to industrial questions were able to settle them, while there was so great political unsettlement. When I went to South Carolina I thought that there at least I must find great social disturbances, and in South Carolina I went to the county of Beaufort, the blackest part of the State in point of population, and that in which black rule has been most complete and has lasted longest. It has the reputation of being a sort of black paradise, and, *per contra*, I rather expected a sort of white hell. There I thought I should see a rough Liberia where the blacks ruled roughshod over the whites. To my great surprise I found exactly the contrary. At no place that I have seen are the relations of the two races better and more peaceable. It is true that many of the whites have suffered very greatly from the war, and from the tax-sales by United States authority to which I

have before alluded, and I am afraid that there are numerous cases of poverty and sad reverse of fortune among them; but that comes of the war which is past. Those whose fortunes or professions have in any degree survived have nothing serious to complain of. The town of Beaufort is a favourite summer resort for white families from the interior. All the best houses are in the occupation of the whites—almost all the trades, professions, and leading occupations. White girls go about as freely and pleasantly as if no black had ever been in power. Here the blacks still control the elections and send their representatives to the State Assembly; but though they elect to the county and municipal offices, they by no means elect blacks only. Many whites hold office, and I heard no complaint of colour difficulties in the local administration. The country about is partly the land on which black proprietor-farmers have been settled with white traders, teachers, &c., in the successful manner which I have already described; partly similar lands of white proprietors who let them out and manage amicably with a black tenantry; partly rice plantations, which, on account of the works of protection and irrigation required, are worked in large farms by hired labour; partly the land and water in which the phosphates before alluded to are found; partly forest and sand-hills; but whatever the tenures and circumstances, I say emphatically that nowhere are the relations between blacks and whites better, and nowhere does a traveller see fewer signs that political difficulties have been fatal to settlement.

"Well, then," I have gone on to ask, "did the black Legislatures make bad laws?" My informants could not say that they did. In truth, though many of the Carpet-baggers were in some sense the scum of the Northern armies, the leading spirits among them seem to have been men of decided education and ability, and the work done under their direction, and a good deal adapted from Northern models, is not at all below the average of American State legislation. What, then, is the practical evil of which complaint is made? The answer is summed up in the one word, corruption. It is alleged that under Carpet-bag rule the most monstrous and inconceivable corruption was all but universal, and that not only were the available public funds made away with, but the States were burdened with terrible debts by those who pretended to represent them, so as to have brought them to the brink of insolvency. I believe there can be no doubt at all that a great deal of corruption did prevail, much more than the ordinary measure of American corruption; it was inevitable that it should be so under the circumstances, but to what degree it was so, it is very difficult to tell. The fact is, that there is no denying that corruption does to some degree exist in American politics, and is not confined to the South. If we are to believe the

common language of Americans themselves, and have regard to their opinions of the motives and character of "politicians," their everyday accusations, and the staple of their caricatures and farces, this corruption must be very widespread indeed. On the other hand, I am inclined to suppose that such accusations are the ordinary form of throwing dirt at any man who is in disgrace, and that while some are true a good many are not well founded. Of course I am not qualified to speak with any confidence, but the general impression I have brought away is, that, as the leading men in America seem to be constantly oscillating between high political office and the management of railways, life insurance companies, and other joint-stock undertakings, many of them have carried into politics what I may call joint-stock morals, and are no better and no worse than our own directors. All the Carpet-bag Governors are as a matter of course accused of the grossest personal corruption; and as soon as they fall from power, it is almost a necessity that they should fly from criminal prosecutions instituted in the local courts under circumstances which give little security for a fair trial. Several Democrats of high position in Georgia have assured me they believe that the Northern gentleman of good antecedents, formerly Governor there, was innocent of the things of which he was accused; in fact, I believe he came back, stood his trial, and was acquitted. In South Carolina I was given the report of the Committee of Investigation disclosing terrible things, and said to be most impartial and conclusive. The general result was to leave on one's mind the belief that undoubtedly a very great deal of pilfering and corruption had gone on, but the tone of the report was far too much that of an indictment, rather than of a judgment, to satisfy me that it could be safely accepted in block. The Governor of Massachusetts has refused to render up the ex-Governor, who asserts his innocence and his readiness to stand his trial if a fair trial be assured.

As regards the State debts, I believe those shown to be fraudulent and unjustifiable have been repudiated long ago, and the Southern States having also had the advantage of writing off all debts incurred during the war, I understand that by far the greater portion of their existing debts were incurred before the war. The debts which Virginia and North Carolina find it necessary to "adjust," were, I am told, very largely incurred for somewhat reckless subventions to railways and other public works. But the railways at any rate exist, and are the making of the country. In South Carolina the whole debt is not large—only, I think, about one and a half millions sterling, all told. On the whole, then, I am inclined to believe that the period of Carpet-bag rule was rather a scandal than a very permanent injury. The black men used their victory with moderation, although the women were sometimes dangerous,

and there was more pilfering than plunder on a scale permanently to cripple the State.

To return to the history of South Carolina. After the withdrawal of the United States troops, the Carpet-baggers were entirely routed and put to flight, and Wade Hampton assumed the undisputed government. He has certainly had much success. His party claim, I believe with justice, that he has done much to restore the finances, promote education, and protect blacks and whites in the exercise of peaceful callings. As regards political matters, his policy amounts, I think, to this;—it is in effect said to the blacks: "If you will accept the present *régime*, follow us, and vote Democratic, we will receive you, cherish you, and give you a reasonable share of representation, local office, &c.; but there shall be nothing for those who persist in voting Republican." Some of them accept these terms, but to vote Democratic is the one thing which the great majority will not do. They may be on excellent terms with white men with whom they have relations, will follow them and be guided by them in everything else, but they have sufficient independence to hold out on that point of voting, even when they have lost their white leaders and are quite left to themselves. They know that they owe their freedom to the Republicans, and it is to them a sort of religion to vote Republican. I think it was in Georgia (where they have not held out so stoutly) that, talking to a small black farmer, an ex-slave, as to the situation, I asked him about the black vote. "Well," he said, "some vote straight, and some don't; some is 'sueded and some is paid, but I vote according to my principles, and my principles is Republican." In South Carolina that is the view of the great body of the blacks, as the Democrats fully admit. Stories are told of personal dependants of the present Governor, who owe everything to him and would do anything else in the world for him, but who will yet openly vote against him. Such, then, was the state of things when the elections of November, 1878, came on.

It seemed to be well known beforehand that the Democrats were determined to win everything in the South. It was said to be a necessity finally to emancipate *all* the States from the scandal of black and Carpet-bag rule, and so far one could not but sympathise with the feeling; but so much had been already achieved, and there was not the least risk of a reaction. On the contrary, the power of the native whites was thoroughly re-established. In South Carolina Wade Hampton's re-election was not opposed, and there was no question whatever that by moderate means the Democrats could retain a very decided majority in the State Legislature. But they were not content with this; they aimed at an absolute possession of everything, leaving no representation to their opponents at all, and

especially at a "solid South," in the United States Congress. "They are determined to win," I was told. "They will get the votes by fair means, if they can, and if not I am sorry to say they will steal 'em." And that is just what was done in South Carolina.

To understand what took place, we must look at the election law prevailing in the United States. It seems to me that if the law had been designed to facilitate fraud, make detection difficult, and render the settlement of disputed elections impossible, it could not have been more skilfully devised. There is something to be said for open voting and something for a well-managed ballot, but the pretended ballot of the United States seems to combine all the evils of both systems. It may be just possible for an independent man connected with no party, who manages the thing skilfully, to conceal his vote; but if he consents to make it known, there can be, and in practice there is, no secrecy whatever. There are no official ballot-papers, numbered and checked so as to be afterwards traced, as with us; every man may deposit in the box any ballot-paper he chooses, written or printed in whatever form he chooses. In practice, voters use papers in a particular form supplied by their own party, so that there can be no mistake which way they vote. There being no means of identifying the papers so cast, everything depends on the honesty and fair dealing of those who have the official management of the polls. In all things the executive Government has much greater power in America than with us, and the party which has the executive power has also the control of the ballot-boxes. They appoint returning boards and election managers at each polling-place, who, when party spirit runs high, are in the interest of the dominant majority. This was carried to an excess in South Carolina during the recent elections. The United States officers are entitled to take certain precautions to see that the United States election law is fairly carried out, but they could only be present at the principal places, and sent very subordinate agents to the other polling-places, where they were hustled and treated with no respect whatever. Under these conditions the elections were held in South Carolina.

There is a remarkable frankness and openness in speaking of the way in which things were managed, and I believe I violate no confidences, because there was no whispering or confidence about it. There was not a very great amount of violence or intimidation. Some Republican meetings were violently interfered with before the election, and on the day of the election there was at some places a certain amount of galloping about, firing guns, and such-like demonstration by men in red shirts; but any intimidation used was rather moral than physical. In all districts where the parties in any degree approach equality, perhaps there would be no very strong grounds



for disputing the victory of the Democrats. It is in the lower districts, where the Republicans are admittedly in an immense majority, that great Democratic majorities were obtained by the simple process of what is called "stuffing the ballot-boxes." For this purpose the Democrats used ballot-papers of the thinnest possible tissue-paper, such that a number of them can be packed inside of one larger paper and shaken out as they are dropped into the box. These papers were freely handed about; they were shown to me, and I brought away specimens of them. I never heard a suggestion that these extraordinary little gossamer-web things were designed for any other purpose than that of fraud. Of course the result of such a system was that there were many more ballot-papers in the box than voters. At one place in the Charleston district where not above one thousand persons voted, there were found, I believe, three thousand five hundred papers in the box. In such case the practice (whether justified by law or not, I know not) is that the election managers blindfold a man, who draws out and destroys the number of papers in excess of the voters. Of course he takes care to draw out the thick papers of the opposite party, and to leave in the thin papers of his own party; so when the process is completed, the Democrats are found to be in a great majority, and the return is so made by the returning board. There are some other grounds of complaint. In some of the black districts the number of polling-places has been so reduced that it is impossible for all who wish to poll to do so in the time allowed. At one or two places the ballot-boxes were stolen and carried off. At one place of which I have personal knowledge the appointed election managers simply kept out of the way, and had no poll at all. Hundreds of blacks who came to vote were told they must go elsewhere, when it was too late to do so. In short, I have no hesitation in saying, as matter within my own knowledge, that if these elections had taken place in England, there were irregularities which must have vitiated them before an election judge a hundred times over.

The result of these elections was that, except in the single county of Beaufort, not one Republican or Independent was returned to the State Legislature, nor, I believe, was a single office-bearer of those persuasions elected. The dominant party took everything, and the Republican members of Congress were all ejected. South Carolina returns a solid Democratic representation to the next Congress.

I have throughout, on the spot as I do now, expressed the opinion that there is no excuse whatever for the lengths to which the triumph of the Democrats has been pushed. Granting that they were fairly justified in vigorous measures to give them the control of the government and legislature, and that they were in a position thus to obtain

a good working majority, there could be no reason for unfairly depriving their opponents of a certain representation. It was bad policy too, for the things that have been done have roused the indignation of the North, and it is believed that the somewhat unexpected Republican successes in the North were in great degree due to the feeling excited by the unfair attempts to make a solid South. Perhaps, for the time, it may not be a matter of the very first importance whether the Democrats have only a good majority in the Southern State Legislatures, or almost the whole representation; but in the present state of parties in Congress two or three seats, or say including Louisiana and Florida, half-a-dozen seats, won by extreme and palpable irregularities and fraud, make a great difference; and the question of these elections raises very large and difficult issues. Not only are nearly balanced parties much affected, but in case of a struggle over the next Presidential election, these votes might just turn the scale; and the question whether there is any remedy practically available to redress wrongs which are I may almost say admitted, puts in issue the wider question whether the 15th Amendment of the United States Constitution, securing equal electoral rights to the blacks, is really to be enforced, or whether it may be set aside in practice by the action of individual States. Is, in fact, the settlement at the end of the war to be maintained or surrendered? The excuse made by the Southern whites for their proceedings is that throughout the United States elections are not pure and free from fraud; that there has been as much of it in New York as in the South; that the laws admitting of such things were made by their enemies to crush them; that the Presidency was "stolen" from them by fraud; and that they are justified in reprisals. I have no doubt that it is an absolute necessity that the election laws should be improved. But besides this there is need of a final laying of the issue between North and South, depending on a due execution of the war settlement. To see how this stands we must glance at the relations between the United States and the States of the Union as things now exist.

When the United States Constitution was originally framed, after the revolutionary war, there was much need of union and much necessity for taxation, for which it provided the means. But as time passed, and the condition of the States rose with peace and prosperity, the external customs revenue sufficed, and more than sufficed, for all common purposes. No internal revenue was raised for the general government, and scarcely any interference of any kind was exercised. We who are accustomed to speak of the United States as one country, hardly realise how entirely as respects internal affairs the Union was, and for most purposes still is, not one country, but a league of many countries. The domestic administration is

peculiar to each State, and under no common control whatever. The United States courts of the original Constitution were few, and confined in practice to larger matters. As I heard a Democratic orator say, with truth I believe, "You hardly knew that there was a United States Government, except when you went to the Post-office for your letters."

After the war the clauses providing for the abolition of slavery and the equality of race and class were the only amendments which it was necessary to introduce into the Constitution; but, nevertheless, there was in addition a very great practical change carried out under provisions of the old Constitution, which had long been almost dormant. The great debt rendered necessary a heavy taxation, and an entirely new system of internal revenue was put in force; whiskey, tobacco, and some other things, being subjected to a heavy excise duty to the general government, which rendered necessary a strong executive control by United States officers in every corner of the United States. Both revenue questions, and many other questions raised by the events of the war, necessitated a great extension of the United States Courts, and brought them as it were to every man's door. These, and some other changes, were common to all the States. In the South there was further required some measure of precaution to give effect to the changes affecting the blacks. Besides the military occupation, for a time, the central legislature was empowered to pass laws to give effect to the new electoral equality, and to station officers to watch the working of those laws. Under these laws the central authority has in theory power to deal with the election abuses which I have mentioned; but in practice it is not so easy. Like our Parliament, Congress can deal with disputed elections to its own body, and when the new Congress meets some months hence, some of these elections will no doubt be brought before it; but it will require a great exercise of virtue, on the part of Democratic members to do a justice which will convert their narrow majority into a narrow minority. Meantime the President may prosecute in the United States Courts those who have broken the election laws. But the first difficulty is that, as such actions will be resisted by every means, the conduct of the prosecutions will be very expensive; and they cannot be carried through without an appropriation for the purpose by a House in which the Democrats have the majority. Then the local people resist in another way: as fast as prosecutions are instituted, the United States subordinate officers are arrested and dragged before the local State magistrates on all sorts of charges; and the witnesses for the prosecution are arrested for perjury and committed for trial before the local State Courts. The President is much urged to vigorous and decisive action, but his position is very difficult. Apparently a Committee of Congress to inquire into electoral abuses

has been appointed, but the terms of reference seem to be so wide that it may be difficult to bring it to a practical issue.

There never can be peace, quiet, and safety in the United States till a mode of settling disputed elections is arranged, and this question of the black vote is definitively laid at rest. There is a curious cross of opinion and interest on this latter question. Before the war, the blacks having no votes, the electoral representation of the South was diminished on that ground. Since all have had votes, the South has a full representation according to population, and thus sends many more members to Congress than ever it did before; and so an almost solid South having been returned on the Democratic side, it curiously happens that the very measure of enfranchising the Negroes, which was expected to have an opposite effect, has now given the Southern Democrats greatly increased power. Seeing this, and the difficulty of dealing with the question, some of the Northerners have inclined to settle the matter by disfranchising the blacks and diminishing the representation in proportion; but this the Southerners stoutly resist. They say, "You gave the blacks votes, and now they shall not be deprived of them." In truth, disfranchisement cannot now be the remedy. I venture to agree with those thoughtful Northern statesmen who say that, whatever temporary inconveniences may attend the policy, deliberately adopted it must be adhered to; for, they say, under our political system the only security that every class shall be fairly treated is that they should have votes. They instance the case of the Chinese in California, who, in their view, are unfairly treated because they have no votes. A man, they say, who has a vote, even if he carries no weight now, is sure to be courted by some party sooner or later. The whites must have divisions among themselves, and then they will be civil to the blacks. I think the experience of our own colonies is entirely in favour of this view. Unrepresented blacks, and other unrepresented classes, are always liable to be treated unfairly under labour laws, vagrant laws, and revenue laws. I am told that in the interval between the war and the adoption of the black-vote clause of the Constitution, some of the Southern legislatures showed a disposition to adopt similar laws, and though they now are honestly free from such ideas, such proposals would probably spring up again if the blacks were not represented.

It must be remembered that the Constitution of the United States imposes no obligation whatever to give universal suffrage to all blacks; all that is required is that there shall be the same rule for black and white. The Southern States are perfectly at liberty to impose any general property qualification, household qualification, or anything else they please—they might very well impose an education qualification such as exists in Massachusetts to this day. With this exception in Massachusetts, however, universal manhood

suffrage has, I think, become a sort of custom of all the States, and perhaps they would find it difficult to depart from it.

What makes it most especially desirable that the question of the black vote should be settled is that in reality there are no other great questions whatever to divide North and South, or black and white. Such is the conclusion to which I have come after very careful inquiry.

Free trade is no longer a question between North and South—in fact, if the truth must be told, it is not now a question in the United States at all. The system is to disarm opposition by protecting everything and everybody. The sugar and rice of the South are protected to conciliate the South. Dwelling on the good management of Georgia a man of position said to me, "Look at Georgia; instead of talking nonsense about free trade they have gone in manfully, established most successful cotton manufactures, and taken the benefit of protection."

Well, then, there is the more burning question, lately the Greenback question, still the question of enhanced debts and depreciated credits, or of cheap silver dollars against dear gold dollars; that question may be very exciting indeed, but it is also not one in which the dividing lines will lie between North and South, or black and white. True, the Southerners owe a good deal of money and want cheap money very badly; but the strong movement in that direction came not from the South, but from Northern agricultural Maine and rich manufacturing Massachusetts. So far from this being a question in which the black vote is dangerous, the fact is that the blacks have divided most impartially on the subject, and it has more than anything else given promise of a new political shuffling of the cards, after which there will be no longer black and white sides, but a wholesome intermixture.

It is true that the old question of State rights as against centralization is now an active factor in American politics; but, so far as I have been able to learn, the present vitality of the question entirely hinges on the disputed black vote. All else that has resulted from the war the Southerners have honestly and fully accepted. Most of the States have accepted even the black vote and made the best of it. There is no rancour and no secessionist spirit left. The temper of the South is for the most part admirable. But two or three States still maintain the struggle as regards the free exercise of the black vote. It is that and that only which raises the question of coercion, irritates the North, and leads to talk of the return of the "man on horseback." If that were out of the way I can discern nothing in regard to which the South has any greater interest in the maintenance of State rights than the North and West. All would no doubt be glad to be rid of Federal taxation and the interference of Federal officers. The North and West would enjoy cheap tobacco just as

much as the South. If it could be so arranged, all the States would equally be most glad to appropriate the drink revenue to their own purposes, and so diminish the weight of direct taxation (for State and local purposes) of which they complain. In no other respect is there question of infringing the State rights of domestic legislation and management in the South more than anywhere else. It was slavery that raised the question of State rights and brought on the war; it is this *sequela* of slavery that keeps the question alive.

#### THE CASTE QUESTION.

There is one more view in which we must look at the question of black and white; I mean the separation of the people of America into two castes, which is becoming more pronounced than ever. Since the North has insisted that the blacks should be admitted to political equality, neither North nor South has made any movement whatever towards admitting them to social equality; in fact, the movement has been rather the other way. A certain friendly familiarity and association was possible and common, more especially in the South, when the parties met on acknowledged terms of superiority and inferiority. Now the whites assert their superiority by social exclusion, and the blacks themselves, unwilling to accept the old situation in social matters, have much withdrawn themselves from associating with the whites on occasions which formerly brought the two races together. This is particularly noticeable in the churches. I am told that in former days almost every church had a recognised black quarter; now the black churches are almost entirely separate from the white churches. It was not unnatural that this should have happened at first, but one might have hoped that prejudices would have been gradually got over. After all it is only matter of habit and custom, and that such a habit can be very completely overcome is shown by the case of the public conveyances, especially the tramway cars so universal in America. I believe it is not long since no black could venture to intrude himself among whites. Now the habit has been established, and the humblest black rides with the proudest white on terms of perfect equality, and without the smallest symptom of malice or dislike on either side. I was, I confess, surprised to see how completely this is the case; even an English Radical is a little taken aback at first.

There is generally no bad feeling or incivility attending the caste separation; on the contrary, I saw nothing but good-feeling and good-temper in the daily relation between the classes; only, like separate Hindoo castes, they do not intermarry, or worship, or eat together. I fear there is not at present much appearance of any abatement of this caste feeling; it is maintained and perpetuated by the separation of the children in the public schools. It has become almost the universal rule of the United States that none

of the schools, high or low, are common to the two races; the whites have their schools, and the blacks have their schools, but there is no intermixture. The question was, I believe, much debated, and in some States it was not settled without much difficulty; but I understand that the general feeling of the blacks themselves was in favour of separate schools; they hardly felt that their children could hold their own against the prejudices of the whites, if they were obliged to go to the white schools, and they preferred to have public schools established for their special benefit. This is now the case wherever the blacks are sufficiently numerous; and the separation is complete in the higher schools and colleges as well as in the lower schools. The curious part of it to the eye of a stranger is the effect on children really white but tainted with some heredity of black blood. One sees some extremely fair children, sometimes fairer than the average of white children, among the ebony, woolly-headed Negroes; it seems hard, but when one says that, one is told that they are entirely accustomed to be so treated and do not feel it. It is hardly to be expected that children brought up in ideas of caste will readily get rid of them when they grow up. Just like Hindoos, they maintain the separation in some things, but not in others. In many places I saw white and black children running freely about in one another's houses, and apparently on very good terms; but still they know where to draw the line. In India we have managed to bring the different castes together in the same schools; but it is not so in America.

We must, then, accept the caste system as a fact. I won't here, discuss the advantages or disadvantages of its complete abolition, to the extent of permitting what is called miscegenation. It has, I believe, been suggested that forty millions of somewhat nervous and over-energetic American whites, in danger of wearing out their physique as the sharp sword wears out the scabbard, might be improved by the small amalgam of four millions of easy-tempered, light-hearted blacks, in the formation of a people of the future, fitted permanently to thrive in the soil and climate of America: but the most pronounced philo-Negro in the Northern States would recoil from such an idea, so we need not mention it. Christianity may effect much to bring the races together, but not quite that for the present. As it is, inter-marriage is now positively prohibited by law in most of the States—an extraordinary state of things among a people putting the equality of man at the head of all their Constitutions! Another suggestion much more frequently, and, indeed, quite persistently made by very many people is, that the races remaining separate, it is not the whites but the blacks who will die out. "They cannot take care of themselves," it is said; "they can neither take care of their children, nor manage themselves in sickness, nor bring themselves to sanitary laws and habits, now that the

benevolent eye of the slave-owner is withdrawn. It is a mere matter of time; they must die out in the end." It is really quite surprising how seriously this is said, when it is so directly contrary to fact. No doubt in the terrible disturbance and unsettlement due to the war, there was much Negro suffering and a good deal of Negro mortality in many places, and even yet the increase of the coloured population is probably not so rapid as it was in the days of skilful and careful slave-breeding, or as it will be when the Negro family system is better established, and the Negro population is more settled and independent. But all statistical figures available show that wherever a new census has been taken, it is found that the Negroes are not diminishing, but increasing more or less fast. It is patent to the eye that they are not a people who have the least intention of dying out; on the contrary, there seems every prospect that as they settle down they will multiply with great rapidity, and will supply the population still so much wanting properly to occupy the Southern States. They are an inevitable fact, and it is incumbent on every well-wisher of America to make the best of them, instead of supposing that Heaven will remove the difficulty.

To me, accustomed to see great communities in India, where varieties of caste do not interfere with union in a common social system, where, on the contrary, caste but represents a variety of occupations and functions in that system, the existence of two castes in America does not seem to present any insuperable obstacle to well-being. In an Indian village there may be, and generally is, a caste of proprietors, a caste of herdsman, a caste of labourers, a caste of money-lenders and shopkeepers, a caste of blacksmiths, and a caste of carpenters, who all live very well together, and support one another by each contributing their functions to the village existence. It is hard, then, if in the United States two castes cannot co-exist, supposing that means of amalgamating them are not found. No doubt it does seem cruel that no black or mulatto of the highest merit can overstep the line which condemns him to a society socially inferior. But very much is open to such a man; there is a great black population among whom he may fulfil great functions. Till the blacks of the South are able to find among their own race professional men, merchants, traders, and other occupants of the higher places now almost entirely monopolized by the whites, it cannot be said that a coloured man fitted to rise has no field in which he may do so.

My own view, then, is extremely sanguine. I cannot see why the black difficulty in America should not be settled, and well settled, and why this great people should not retain among them a settled, industrious, and progressive coloured population, fitted to fill the portions of the country not adapted for the white race, and there to contribute to the wealth, the greatness, and the resources of the common country.

G. CAMPBELL.



## THE BRIGHT CLAUSES OF THE IRISH LAND ACT:

### A SUPPLEMENTARY PLEA FOR PEASANT PROPRIETORS.

PEASANT proprietors are rarely met with in any part of Great Britain, and are, indeed, almost non-existent in its northern division; but in the southern, few as they are there also, they are still many times more numerous than in the sister island. In 1870, out of some 20,000 owners among whom the whole of agricultural Ireland—an area of more than 20 millions of acres—was divided, the number possessing more than one and less than 50 acres, or 21 acres each on an average, was but 3,827, of whom, too, many let their land instead of themselves cultivating it; so that, if by peasant proprietors are to be understood tillers of their own fields, the number of Irishmen who could properly be so designated was so infinitesimally small, as to render only more conspicuous the absence of anything deserving to be called a *class* of such proprietors. Now, on this side of St. George's Channel there is something more, albeit not much, of the same kind to boast of. In England, out of about 150,000 fortunate participants in the ownership of 27 millions of cultivable acres, about 70,000 are owners of less than 50 acres each, a number which, after due deduction for proprietors of villas and cottages of gentility, seems to represent a sprinkling of genuine yeomen perceptibly denser than can be found in Ireland. But if England and Ireland be compared, not with each other, but with the Channel Islands, or with almost any part of continental Europe, the contrast presented becomes very striking. In Guernsey, the maximum size of an estate is very little, if at all, more than 50, or in Jersey, than 100 acres. In France, the present number of land-owners cannot by the most niggard computation be reduced below 4 millions, and two-thirds of the entire country are now occupied by peasant properties. In Flanders and some other Belgian provinces the proportion of such properties is equally great; in Switzerland still greater; and very great also in Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, and Russia. In the two last-mentioned countries their multiplication has been promoted by direct governmental action; the names of Maria Theresa and her son Joseph being inseparably connected with the first onslaught against serfage in Austria, and those of Stein and Hardenberg with its final subversion in Prussia; while the recent transformation, from serfs into freeholders, of the main body of the Russian people, must needs, if Fame have any sense of justice, secure to the reigning Czar Alexander a like glorious immortality.

Emulous, perhaps, of these illustrious examples, Mr. Gladstone's Ministry ventured on some cautious steps in the same direction. They had, doubtless, observed that wherever peasant proprietors abound, there is a corresponding absence of certain ugly symptoms with which one or other of the two chief British Islands has long been familiar; that there is not regularly every winter a general pauperization of rural labourers; that there are no wholesale evictions of desperate tenants, no associations for the assassination of landlords, no rick-burnings, no cattle-houghings; that the sorest agricultural distress seldom or never takes the form of agrarian riot; and they resolved on trying to determine, by actual experiment, whether conveyance of proprietary rights to some moderate proportion of the Irish peasantry might not inoculate the whole mass with that respect for property which the possession of property naturally begets. Accordingly, the Commission created under the Irish Church Act of 1869 was required, in disposing of the Church lands, to offer the privilege of pre-emption to the occupying tenants, and was empowered, if the offer were accepted, to leave three-fourths of the purchase-money, together with interest thereon at four per cent., payable in sixty-four half-yearly instalments. Again, by clauses introduced by Mr. Bright into the Irish Land Act of 1870, the Landed Estates Court was directed, while dealing with properties brought within its jurisdiction, to facilitate, so far as possible, consistently with due regard to the interests of the owners, the purchase by tenants of their respective holdings; while the Board of Public Works was empowered to advance, by way of mortgage on the holdings so purchased, two-thirds of the purchase money, conditionally on its being paid, together with interest at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., in seventy half-yearly instalments. The first of these arrangements has operated very successfully. The total extent of land at the disposal of the Church Commissioners was 108,000 acres, representing an annual rental of £95,430, and a selling value of about £2,200,000, and was divided into 8,432 holdings, whereof about 4,000, exclusive of some 500 mere house properties or labourers' cabins, have been sold to bonâ-fide tenants, and about 1,800 to outsiders, about 2,200 still remaining undisposed of. On the other hand, the Bright clauses of the Land Act have hitherto been a nearly complete failure. Although during the six years ending with 1876, property representing a fee simple value of £5,872,000, and an annual rental of £230,000, paid by about 11,500 tenants, was sold by the Landed Estates Court, only 605, or rather more than 5 per cent., of the tenants purchased, instead of 75 per cent. under the Church Act. Out of the million sterling which the Treasury has been authorised to advance to tenants, only about £400,000 had been advanced up to March of last year.

Struck by so wide a difference in the results of two enactments aiming at one self-same object, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, M.P. for Reading, well known for his intelligent and energetic advocacy of the public interest in all *questions terriennes* recently agitated, obtained in 1877 a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into its causes; and the fruits of the Committee's labours during two successive sessions have since appeared in the form of a brace of blue-books. The explanation sought for was not far to seek, and may to a great extent be summed up thus: That whereas the Church Commissioners took great pains to enable an ignorant peasantry to understand and appreciate the facilities placed within their reach, the Landed Estates Court deemed itself to be adequately carrying out the intentions of Parliament in leaving the peasantry to discover for themselves the nature and value of those facilities. When the Commissioners first began to put up the Church lands for sale, they found that the tenants were not generally prepared to take advantage of the offers made to them; many so completely misconstruing them as to imagine that the purchase money demanded would only secure a perpetual lease, and that the rent would still remain payable for ever; while even the more enlightened few were appalled by the legal technicalities and expenses which they expected to have to encounter if they took the initiative in negotiating for the purchase of their farms. The Commissioners, therefore, arranged that the initiative should be taken for them, and that everything should be made easy for them. No Church tenant is under the necessity, so terrible to an illiterate man, of writing a letter. In every case a fair price is put upon the farm, an offer of which, accompanied by clear printed instructions what to do, is then made to the farmer, who has only to write, or get written for him, from one to six words on a printed form, to sign his name or affix his mark, and to provide within three months one-fourth of the purchase money, and the thing is done. A simple form of conveyance and mortgage, whereby the cost of the transaction is reduced to a minimum, is executed, and the rent-paying tenant is at once transformed into a landed proprietor. Moreover, the Commissioners, although as a rule prohibiting subdivision, placed no restriction on alienation, thus leaving purchasing tenants at liberty to borrow, on the security of their newly acquired freeholds, part of that fourth of the total price which was required to be paid immediately. On the other hand, the Landed Estates Court issued no notices whatever until two years after the passing of the Land Act, and the notice which was then at last decided upon did little more than apprise a tenant that if he desired to purchase he must, within a specified period, appear in person or by attorney before the Court's Examiner in Dublin, without affording him any information as to the terms on which the Board

of Works would be prepared to advance a portion of the purchase money. Neither was this latter Board more prodigal of advice or active aid. On the contrary, it has generally declined to entertain any proposal with respect to a farm, a title for which had not been derived from the Estates Court, where the lowest cost of passing an entire property through is stated to be £100, and where the total costs of sale of portions thereof to tenants range from eleven to eighteen per cent. of the price proper. It has uniformly placed the most stringent construction on the clauses of the Land Act opposed to sub-letting and alienation, and, under instructions from the Treasury, has so grudgingly interpreted the clauses respecting advances that the advances actually made have in many cases been only one-half of the purchase money, instead of the two-thirds on which the purchasers had warrantably reckoned. It would, however, be most unjust to charge either Court or Board with needless obstructiveness in the matter. Both simply acted in conscientious conformity with their sense of duty, holding their primary obligation to be, the one that of protecting the interests of the landlords, the other that of the State. The Court consequently refrained from putting up an estate for sale in lots which, though suitable for the tenants, might leave on hand an unsaleable residue, while the Board deemed it to be above all things incumbent on them to obtain adequate security before consenting to make advances. Still, however legitimate the mode of operation adopted, Mr. Lefevre's Committee were almost unanimously of opinion that its effect had been to reduce the Bright clauses to a dead letter. It was represented to them that, at the present rate of progress, twenty years must elapse before the million sterling placed at the disposal of the Treasury for the purposes of those clauses will have been distributed as advances in aid to tenants, and one thousand years before a sixth part of 600,000 occupiers of land can be converted into owners, and they have come to the conclusion that further legislation is indispensable if it be desired to give sensible effect to the intentions of the Legislature. They consider that the main defect of the law as it stands consists in its imposing on the Landed Estates Court the impracticable task of reconciling the irreconcilable interests of sellers and buyers; and foremost among their recommendations consequently are that the Court be restricted to the function of selling to the best advantage such estates as may be offered for sale, but that the Board of Works, after being suitably reconstituted, be specially charged with the duty of superintending and facilitating the purchase of their several farms by the occupying tenants, being intrusted with sufficient funds for the purpose, with a view to their purchasing estates or parts of estates in order to the subsequent sale of the same to such of the tenants as, with the aid of advances from the Board, may be

able and willing to buy. The Committee further recommend that the Board be empowered to advance as much as three-fourths of the purchase money, instead of only two-thirds, and likewise, with the concurrence of the Estates Court and of the individual landowners concerned; to make similar advances to tenants who may be content to acquire in perpetuity the fee farm instead of the fee simple of their holdings; also that the existing restrictions against alienation or assignment of land acquired with the help of the Board's advances be repealed, but that those against subdivision or subletting be rigorously maintained. These are the most important of the Committee's proposals, and the remainder of this paper will be employed in endeavouring to demonstrate the desirableness of the object which their recommendations have in view.

At the threshold of the inquiry we may be met by an objection to any further legislation of the kind suggested, an objection applying indeed quite as much to all the past as to any future legislation, viz., that it would interfere artificially with arrangements which, according to orthodox political economy, ought to be left to the operation of natural laws. To this it might be an adequate reply, if no other were forthcoming, that if natural laws, economic or other, be responsible for the deplorable agrarian anomalies which have made Ireland a byword among nations, those laws cannot be entitled to much respect; and that, on the contrary, there would be some consolation in perceiving that they are capable of being violated—that art is here, as elsewhere, competent to correct the evil tendencies of nature. But how stand the facts? What had natural law to do with the sentence of abrogation passed early in the seventeenth century by the King's Bench on ancient Irish tenures, tanistry, and the like, out of which “lewd customs,” as they were judicially pronounced to be, might gradually have been evolved copyholds and freeholds analogous to those into which, in England and the Continent, villein and servile tenures have been transformed? What with the attribution by the same authority to the Crown of the fee simple of the entire island, and with the adoption by the subsequent Crown grantees of entails and primogeniture in lieu of the previous custom of gavelkind? What with the wholesale Elizabethan, Stuart, and Cromwellian confiscations and plantations, and with William and Anne's penal enactments against Catholics, whereby the great bulk of the people were absolutely debarred from acquiring any rights whatever in the soil; or with the almost incredible selfishness and insolence of British commercial legislation, which left the whole nation with scarcely any industrial resource except that very agriculture which concomitant legislation had done its best to render sterile? Surely these enormities and their consequences were the work, not of natural, but of statute law, and he must be a very peculiar economist and juris-

consult who holds it to be unwarrantable for statute law to endeavour to repair the mischief which statute law has done.

In the present instance, at any rate, both political economy and political philosophy, speaking through the mouths of Mr. Bright, a member of the Committee, and of Mr. Vernon, Sir W. H. Gregory, Mr. O'Hagan, Professor Baldwin, Judge Flanagan, and other witnesses, have tendered widely different advice, part of which ought to commend itself in an especial manner to conservatives. Agrarian discontent has been, time out of mind, one chief bane of Ireland, where, moreover, agrarian and national discontent are almost synonymous terms. One, and that by far the largest, section of the people, may be regarded as divided into two hostile camps, one manned by some 20,000 landlords, the other by 600,000 comparative lacklands—their tenant occupiers—whose antagonism to their superiors is very generally embittered by differences of race and of religion. As to all questions, therefore, connected with the relations between owners and tenants, and, indeed, as to all political or social questions whatsoever, tenant opinion outweighs proprietary opinion by fifty to one, and outweighs it more particularly where proprietary rights are concerned. But what more likely means are there of adjusting the balance between the conflicting pretensions of the few and the many, than that of augmenting the number of the former and diminishing the number of the latter? If 50,000 or 100,000 proprietors were added to the 20,000 actually existing, each of the new creations would presumably be converted from an assailant into a staunch defender of the rights of property; would become a centre of loyalty from which the same sentiment would be diffused around—a special constable, as it were, on the side of law and order. Nor would this salutary change of feeling be confined to the new landowners; for, over and above those *in esse*, there would be a still larger number *in posse*—farmers and labourers who, seeing how many of their fellows had raised themselves in the social scale, would naturally aspire to similar elevation, and instead of contesting, would be among the foremost to proclaim the validity of rights, in which they now might reasonably hope to share. In proportion as the peasantry thus became transformed into landowners, actual or expectant, they would become reconciled to a constitution which had favoured and fostered so satisfactory a metamorphosis, and grow lukewarm in the cause of Fenianism and Home Rule. Incidental advantages, too important to be overlooked, would be that there would then be a class, the want of which has long been so grievously felt, capable of furnishing jurors proof against the influences of agrarian or other agitation, and that with the sense of increased security thereupon prevailing, capital would no longer be deterred

from industrial investments which, while attracting to themselves some of the over-numerous competitors for agricultural employment, would yet stimulate agriculture by offering improved markets for agricultural produce.

Already to indulge in these pleasing prognostications may, however, be premature, inasmuch as they certainly take for granted a good deal which is still sturdily disputed, and which requires to be proved before it can serve as a safe basis for deduction. It is indispensable to state the grounds for belief that conversion into peasant proprietors of some considerable proportion of the Irish tenantry would both quiet the murmurs of those immediately benefited, and tend to propitiate the large residue whom it would encourage to look forward to similar amelioration. In doing this it will be unnecessary to revive the old controversy as to the comparative merits and demerits of peasant proprietorship in the abstract, which was warmly waged not long ago, but may now be treated as virtually settled. The Macculloch school of economists, who took the disparaging side of the argument, if not absolutely extinct, has but few survivors left, and these are silent, at least, if not convinced. No one now continues to malign peasant proprietors as lazy sots, too poor to keep either horse or cow, or to provide themselves with costlier implements than spade and hoe; never draining, and seldom manuring, yet habitually overcropping their land, and themselves consuming almost the whole of its scanty produce, and leaving next to none for the subsistence of non-agricultural classes. No one now insists that peasant properties, however small at first, must inevitably grow smaller and smaller through perpetual subdivision, so that a country infected by them must eventually degenerate into a pauper warren, whose teeming swarms can attain to no higher vocation than that of hewers of wood and drawers of water for neighbouring nations wise enough to have maintained ancestral landlordism in all its original vigour. Rather has every one who, observing for himself, has extended his observations far enough, come round to Adam Smith's opinion that "a small proprietor, who knows every part of his little territory, who views it with all the affection which property, especially small property, naturally inspires, and who, upon that account, takes pleasure not only in cultivating but in adorning it, is generally, of all improvers, the most industrious, the most intelligent, and the most successful." Everybody knows that what is nowadays regretted in France is not the excessive progress but the stationariness of population, and that the predicted pauperization of the people has, at all events, not prevented them from paying off, within two years after the close of a peculiarly desolating war, two hundred millions sterling of war indemnity. Every one likewise who knows anything of the matter, knows also that not gluttony or drunkenness, but too

much self-denial as to meat and drink, is one of the faults of peasant proprietors; while whoever chooses to inquire may, among other equally pertinent facts, discover that the petty freeholders of the Channel Islands extort from the soil, over and above what they and their families consume, a surplus of produce for the subsistence of other people three times as large per acre as that obtained by the tenants of large estates in England.

Still, although the virtue of peasant proprietorship in congenial circumstances be pretty generally admitted, there may be in the circumstances of Ireland certain peculiarities adverse to the development of that virtue. Past experience has not much to say as to this point, but what little it does say is not particularly encouraging. Although, until the Land and Church Acts came into operation, there may have been literally no peasant proprietors in the full sense of the term, there were a good many specimens of a class closely analogous, that, namely, of tenants in perpetuity or *quasi* perpetuity, at fixed rents. Thus, an estate of 23,300 acres at Bellachy, in county Derry, was, at different dates in the last century, let on perpetually renewable leases to occupiers, originally 219, but subsequently 2,764 in number, with holdings at present averaging 8 acres each. Early in the same century the Limavaddy estate, in the same county, was let on similar terms, and at rents merely nominal, to 13 tenants, since multiplied into 68. Sir F. Heygate, speaking from personal knowledge, says that most of the owners of these perpetuities are "notoriously the worst cultivators and in the greatest destitution of any in the whole country;" while an equally unimpeachable witness, Mr. Bence Jones, says of an entire town-land adjoining his own property in county Cork, and held on leases for 2,000 years, that the people are not nearly so well off as his own tenants. It is urged, too, that the soil and climate of Ireland differ greatly for the worse from those of most of the Continental countries in which peasant properties flourish, not merely forbidding the culture of the vine, olive, silk, and other products which best repay the minute pains of the small husbandman, but rendering even corn a very untrustworthy crop. It is likewise, and only too truly, insisted, that there is in Ireland a deplorable lack of the traditional industry and skill which in certain other parts of the Continent make amends for the niggardliness of nature. Take Flanders, for instance, whose earliest colonists found there nothing but an expanse of intermingled sand and marsh, which would have ruined any one who had attempted reclamation on a large scale, or with hired labour, but on which, by reason of its apparently utter worthlessness, whoever pleased was permitted to squat and to undertake its reclamation piecemeal. Only by the incessant toil and affectionate tending of generation after generation—that labour of love never exhibited except by men working on their own account—could the original sand have been converted into the rich mould



whose exuberance now strikes every stranger with astonishment. The process adopted may still be seen in operation at every stage. On either side of the railway which runs eastward along the coast from Dunkirk towards Nieuport the tourist notices with amazement, dotting here and there the otherwise absolutely naked waste, a bit of luxuriant garden ground encircling a neat cottage embosomed in trees. The history of each of these veritable oases is that some poor fellow or other, most likely a poor fisherman, seated himself there and began by building a hut for himself and a sty for a pig, and enclosing an acre or two within a wall of sods. Then, having thus secured the sand from being swept off bodily in whirlwinds, he thickened it by mixing with it pig's dung, sea-weed, fish bones, and fish guts, and perhaps by planting it with brushwood, to be either dug in green or used for fuel, and so furnish ashes for manure, until the ground acquired substance enough to afford feed for a cow, and finally to enable its improver to turn market-gardener, renowned as far as Ostend for mealy potatoes. This sort of thing, which may still be seen going on in the locality named, and also in the Campine and other parts of the interior of Belgium, went on for centuries all over Flanders, educating the people in the same measure as it ameliorated the soil. The present race of Flemish husbandmen have inherited, together with the fields created by their forefathers, the habits of industry and thrift and the farseeing skill employed in the creation. There is not a day nor an hour of daylight in which they may not be found ploughing, digging, harrowing, hoeing, manuring, sowing, or finally garnering the heterogeneous fruits of their unremitting toil, while their children, who ever since early dawn have, except during school hours, been on the roads or commons, are carefully picking up and depositing in their little carts every particle of those precious substances which have been euphemistically described as attesting the passage of horses or sheep. The system of husbandry, too, bequeathed to and sedulously followed by them, is one from which the best English agriculturists have largely borrowed, and might still borrow with advantage. But it is only too notorious that no similar legacies have come down to the Irish peasant. No one will work more with a will under adequate encouragement, no one is more quick-witted or readier to learn, but no habits of industry, no technical acquirements are his by birthright. His progenitors have for many generations been not petty freeholders, the whole produce of whose labours and improvements were their own, and who, therefore, were constantly labouring and improving, but rack-rented tenants-at-will, who, after working enough to secure for their own subsistence as many potatoes as their task-masters chose to leave them, would, by working longer or better, have simply gained permission to choose between submitting to further exactions and being summarily turned adrift. Naturally they fell into habits of dawdling

over their work and of doing it in the slovenliest fashion, and these habits they have bequeathed to their descendants. Moreover, another baneful bequest of theirs is assumed to be an incorrigible proneness to divide and subdivide territorial possessions among the holders' children, so that in Ireland, at all events, whatever might happen elsewhere, peasant properties, however small at first, would tend continually to become smaller, until the limit was reached at which none but paupers could subsist upon them.

These are considerations whose intrinsic force, irrespectively of the weight of authority by which they are pressed, entitle them to most serious attention; but the more carefully they are examined, the less reason will they be found to furnish for despairing of the experiment which Mr. Gladstone's Ministry originated, and which Mr. Lefevre's Committee desire to see continued and extended.

In industrial affairs, as in morals, most people's standard of excellence is a purely conventional one; as they see others doing, they are content to do themselves; taking for granted that the prevalent practice must be right, and not dreaming of evolving a higher model out of their own inner consciousness. In this way may perhaps be partly explained the destitution of the perpetuity tenants referred to a page or two back. If their lot had been cast in Flanders they would have found themselves in the midst of hard-working cultivators, and imitating the examples set them on all sides, would have gone on steadily improving their land's condition and their own. But in Ireland, and a hundred years ago, almost their only neighbours must have been lazy, sluttish farmers, with here and there a Squire Lumpkin intermixed, whose only ambition, if he had any, was to keep the best dogs, horses, and girls in the county. Very likely, too, the 219 perpetuitants at Ballachy among whom 23,300 acres were originally divided, on coming into possession of something like 100 acres each, were disposed to give themselves the airs of squireens, and spent more of their time in the hunting-field and the alehouse than in looking after their business; so that, although as long as they lived they may have revelled in the sluttish abundance of potatoes and buttermilk so graphically described by Arthur Young, they can have left behind them little but a few exhausted fields to be divided and sub-divided amongst a progeny trained from their birth upward to be if possible more dissolute than their fathers. But Irish agriculture and agriculturists have changed sufficiently within the last twenty years to warrant our declining to accept such a past as augury for the future. Let us turn to specimens of more recently created perpetuitants—to some of those who have risen to that station with the aid of the Church Acts. One of these, Mr. Andrew Degnan, a farmer in county Cavan, told his own story to the Committee. He and his father before him had rented 53 acres of glebe-land at £30 18s. a year. About forty years ago, during his

father's time, the then vicar left, having been made a bishop, whereupon his successor began by doubling the rents all round, promising, however, not to raise them again during his incumbency. But what he had already done was not forgotten by the tenants, who no longer "found the same haste for putting a good crop in the ground," and who, "if a man were seen draining a field, would laugh at him, saying that this vicar too would go away and be made a bishop, and that then the rent would be raised again." In 1870 Degan, hearing that under the Church Act tenants would get the privilege of buying their holdings, set about building a house upon his, which cost him £400, and made also some other improvements. In 1874 he bought his farm for £690, paying one-fourth down, "with a better heart than he had ever before paid money in his life," and giving a mortgage for the balance. During the four years which have since elapsed he has laid out £180 in building offices, and has bought timber and slates in Dublin to build more; has spent £50 in draining, hung a good many iron gates, besides four which he has ready to hang, and has made about 330 perches of ditches and quicks. Other tenants of his acquaintance on neighbouring glebes who have similarly bought, "are carrying on three times the industry there is going on upon the adjoining farms to them, working day and night to improve the land—on a moonlight night just as well as in daylight." He calculates that in about five years the land "will be worth twice as much as before, and will bear twice as productive a crop. He has seen the proof of it. He, for his part, would not take £2,000 for the place which has cost him only £690." Observing the change of feeling that has taken place among his fellow purchasers, he considers that there "never was a grander thing out" than the new plan of promoting the purchase of their holdings by men who have the money, provided it be carried far enough. "In the first place it would do away with the Society business in Ireland, such as Fenianism, and so on. It would satisfy the people altogether; the dissatisfied way in which they have been going on would be abolished; they would all be in sympathy with the police and the Government." Having obtained "an interest in the country they would study the interest of the Government. They would not wish that there should be any war, whereas at present many are just praying that it may rise in an hour to cut them off. When they felt they had the Government for their protector, then their sympathies would lie towards the Government."

Mr. Degan may be a man of sanguine temperament, and may be generalizing too hopefully from inadequate particulars, but most of what further evidence was given to the Committee on the points touched by him was substantially corroborative of his testimony. We "are all proud to be freeholders," writes a man who had bought his farm in Donegal, speaking of himself and those of his neighbours who had

done the like. "As for improvements I have made a great deal. I have built a house forty feet long, and put English slates on; and for quarrying, subsoiling, and draining, and making land out of the solid rock, I have laid out as much as would have bought a small farm, whereas if I had been paying rent I would have done very little." This case, though admitted to be unusual, is declared not to be exceptional, and Mr. O'Brien, by whom it was cited, and who as valuer under the Church Commission has personally visited almost all the glebes in Ireland previously to sale, and several of them since, "inquiring in different places and wherever he goes how the tenants are getting on, how they have raised the money, and what expenses they have been put to," has found in almost every instance that they are perfectly well satisfied with their bargains and busily engaged in turning them to account. Of two sample cases mentioned by him, the first was that of an estate in Kilkenny, described in 1869 by Mr. W. S. Trench, Lord Lansdowne's agent, as "one of the worst circumstanced he had ever seen, consisting of a numerous and pauper population, wretchedly housed, and highly rented." In 1871 it was bought by the tenants, apparently about twenty-two in number, and these were visited by Mr. O'Brien a few months ago, when he found them "very comfortable," talking indeed of the "considerable straits to which they had been put to raise money to pay for their farms," but adding that they were "recovering, very much contented and better off than they ever were before." The second case was in county Waterford, a property where the farms were larger and the tenants *stronger* than usual, and able many of them to pay down at once the whole purchase money, or portions ranging from £200 to £600. These new owners were found at the beginning of last year very well satisfied with their purchases, and making improvements. One was building a good substantial fence which would cost a good deal of money; another had built a large range of offices—substantial stone structures with English slated roofs, and had also collected a great heap of stones for a new dwelling-house, instead of the thatched one in which he was still living.

This is not a bad beginning; indeed, things would seem to have been going so well hitherto as to leave little more to be desired than that a process which has produced such satisfactory results should be continued on a wider scale and with accelerated speed. This view of the matter, however, might possibly prove deceptive. It need not be doubted that proprietary rights such as a minute fraction of the Irish peasantry have acquired during the last six years, would, if conveyed to the main body, stimulate the main body to an assiduous industry never yet displayed by them; but, unaided, they might scarcely suffice to impart the technical skill in which that same peasantry have as yet been still more obviously deficient. There may be no overstrained metaphor in saying with Arthur Young that

the magic of property turns sand into gold, but in order to do so the magic requires a practised alchemist. A rack-rented crofter is no more likely to be turned into a good farmer by being simply invested with the fee simple of his croft, than a street organist to become an accomplished musician by being seated before a grand pianoforte. One and the other equally must first learn the capacities of his instrument and how to develop them. No doubt a husbandman who has not to pay rent must, *ceteris paribus*, be better off than one who has, inasmuch as the whole produce of his industry must needs be greater than a part, but if this be his sole advantage he may nevertheless be very badly off. Small properties almost of necessity imply small farms, but small farms require small farming, and the Irish peasant has still to learn what small farming means. Whatever the size of his holding, whether as little as five or as large as fifty acres, he would, if he took a Fleming for his pattern, change his present practice altogether. In the one case he would cease to depend almost exclusively on potatoes, with perhaps a pig to boot; in the latter he would grow little or no corn; and in either case he would keep little, if any, of his ground under natural grass, but on the principle of "no cattle, no dung; no dung, no crop," would devote half of it at least to root-crops and artificial grasses for the feeding of live stock. Enriching his fields in this way, and exchanging the plough for—or largely supplementing it with—the spade, he could raise quantities of produce that would amaze any one but a market-gardener, and maintain quantities of stock at which the most successful grazier might well stare. Mr. Rham noticed, forty years ago, that a beast for every three acres was a common Flemish proportion, and that on very small occupations, where spade husbandry was used, the proportion was still larger. And I have myself counted on one Flemish farm of ten acres four cows, two calves, one horse, and two pigs, besides rabbits and poultry; on a second of thirty-eight acres, a bull, six cows, two heifers, and a horse, besides seventy-five sheep fed partly on the neighbouring stubbles; and on a third of thirty-two acres, eight cows, six bullocks, a calf, and four pigs.

If similar sights have not hitherto presented themselves in Ireland, it is not nature that is to blame. Besides that the Irish climate, though damper and cooler in summer than the Flemish, is warmer in winter, its greater dampness is a positive advantage so far as forage and roots are concerned, while as to soil that of Ireland "produces natural pasture spontaneously, whereas the Flemish hardly permits of the natural growth of heather and furze." It was originally mere powdered quartz and flint, through which, until thickened by the intermixture of vegetable and animal refuse, water ran as through a filtering stone, and which even now, "after being fertilised by ten centuries of laborious husbandry, does not yield a single crop without being manured—a fact unique in Europe." But

in Flanders the perfection of art makes abundant amends for the deficiencies of nature. The spade is never idle in the hands of boors whose proverb boasts of its having proved to them the key of a gold mine. The cattle are continuously, perhaps too continuously, stall-fed. The country people waste no particle of their own manure, and eagerly buy up that of the town, instead of allowing it to drift into the sea, polluting the rivers on its way. Very varied and rapidly succeeding crops keep the ground under tribute throughout the year, and every patch of turnip or mangel-wurzel, flax, rape, chicory, or cabbages, is as minutely weeded as the tulip and ranunculus beds of an English garden.

In proof that Irishmen might readily be trained to do all this and with equally satisfactory results, we have not merely Flemish, but also some, though not much, English experience to appeal to. There are not many peasant proprietors still left in England, but there are a few. Though Kentish yeomen have already died, and Cumbrian "statesmen" are fast dying out, through ignorance of the means of self-preservation which judicious culture of their little freeholds would afford, there may yet be found, scattered here and there over the country, some rare specimens of a kindred class; and on behalf of these, some very remarkable evidence was not long ago brought forward by a very leading counsel indeed, no other than the *Times* newspaper, which in 1874 deputed to the Eastern Counties a special correspondent to investigate the causes of the agricultural lock-out of that year. The intelligent curiosity of the gentleman selected for this duty led him to inquire into matters only incidentally connected with the immediate object of his mission; and in his reports he says a good deal about the peasant farmers, tenants of from ten to sixty acres, with whom he came in contact. Of most of them he says nothing at all complimentary except in regard to their industry; admitting that they are invariably singularly hard-working, he points out that they usually do their work in the wrong way. They give their labour without stint, but they put little else into the land, and yet subject it to the most exhaustive treatment, sometimes drawing from it as many as two successive white crops, and keeping no live stock except pigs and perhaps a single cow or a blind horse or a donkey. Possessing scarcely any capital besides their own labour, they do not allow their fields the full benefit even of the little they have. Out of one hundred and thirteen tenants in a certain Cambridgeshire village, thirty hold less than ten acres and twenty-four others less than twenty acres each; but of the thirty only one, and of the twenty-four only two employ themselves exclusively as farmers, all the rest being in addition publicans, brickmakers, shopkeepers, carriers, flymen, or occasionally hiring themselves out as labourers. Tenants like these, charged as they commonly are with one-third more rent than would be exacted from large farmers,

"cramped for want of capital, and farming badly in consequence, hard hit by one bad season and ruined by two or three in succession," and compelled whenever a cow dies to send round the hat for subscriptions to buy another, must needs, however hard they work, live at least as hardly, and their daily fare is accordingly described as consisting of "black gritty bread, cheese hard as stone, butter made of whey" (a manufacture, by the way, implying peculiar ingenuity), "thin sour beer, and stringy rancid bacon." They would not be worse off if they changed places with their own labourers, and would indeed be decidedly better off if they could exchange with some of the labourers on Sir Edward Kerrison's estate near Eye, four hundred of whom have one hundred acres divided amongst them as allotments, and "make far more out of that acreage than any single farmer would make."

But if this be the general rule as to English peasant farmers, it is open to exceedingly significant exceptions. Even among the peasant farmers who furnished materials for the foregoing picture was one who is described as having managed somehow or other to raise five quarters of wheat from a single acre. Another, holding six acres, on which he grew wheat, barley, and beans, got no less than six quarters of wheat per acre, "nigh double as much as a large farmer." A third, though paying £19 a year for two acres and a cottage, made "a fair living" out of his little plot, fair enough to allow of his keeping a cart and pony. But the *Times'* correspondent met besides with a few genuine peasant proprietors: men who, "beginning with a bit of land, had raised themselves from the farm-labourer class into positions of fair independence, though at starting they had little more than the proverbial 2½d. in their pockets." One of these, John Sillet, of Kelsale, near Saxmundham, deserves to have his story told a little in detail. He had begun life by serving a few years behind the counter, where he saved a good bit of money; but he was fond of rural pursuits, and eagerly read whatever books on husbandry came in his way. Meeting one day with some pithy directions in a newspaper "how to keep a cow and a pig on an acre of land," and soon afterwards with instructions in Cobbett's *Cottage Economy* how to do the like on a quarter of an acre, he resolved to put the value of these lessons to the test, and accordingly bought two acres of "beautiful pasture," which he forthwith began to break up and to plant with potatoes, mangel-wurzel, swedes, drumhead cabbages, and other vegetables, to the scorn and pity of his neighbours, who were quite sure he did not know what he was about. But the laugh was turned against the scorers when, very soon afterwards, and while only two-thirds of his two acres were as yet broken up, he was seen feeding two cows and a heifer, two calves, and two pigs, growing three crops of potatoes, beans, and swedes, or four crops of cabbages, wheat, potatoes, and swedes, on the same ground within the year,

and showing an annual balance sheet with £74 to the good. This was in 1847, only five years after his purchase of his little freehold, since when he has presumably gone on steadily bettering himself; but even then he could boast of deriving from it "all the good living a rational man could desire, all the bread, meat, vegetables, milk, butter, &c., which his family, consisting of himself, his wife, and two children, wished for."

Sillet's case is not unique: it is nearly matched by that of William Beere, of Calne, in Wiltshire, whose self-recorded experiences have likewise been inscribed in the columns of the *Times*. His first holding was only half an acre, and was a great help to him. He then had a family of small children, and was working as a farm labourer for 8s. 6d. a week; but succeeding afterwards in getting an additional acre and a half, he gave up his regular employment, and has never had occasion to regret it. He now occupies three acres, of which one is his own, having been purchased eight years ago with his savings. He tills the ground entirely with the spade or steel fork, but in other respects his practice is perhaps scarcely so scientific as Sillet's, though it answers exceedingly well. He usually "plants two of his acres with potatoes; on the third he grows wheat and roots—parsnips, mangels, and swedes—generally some of each. The best of his potatoes he sends to market, and with the worse sort he fattens between thirty and forty pigs a year." Of wheat he has raised at the rate of eighteen sacks an acre, "probably a greater quantity than any large farmer in the neighbourhood, however well he might cultivate his land." This is "either consumed by his family or sold, while the straw is particularly useful for litter and valuable for manure."

No doubt, English examples like those of Beere and Sillet are very rare, though the former says that there are in his neighbourhood many persons occupying no more land than himself, and benefiting similarly by the possession. But for the purpose for which they are here cited, two cases are as good as a thousand. The moral desired to be drawn from them is, that if in England small farms are commonly failures, it is because they are scarcely ever cultivated in the right way; that small farms require a special mode of culture, and that if the proper mode be adopted, they may become in the British Islands, as well as on the Continent, far more productive than the best large farms, far more productive, too, of precisely those things which we most need and which it is most indispensable to raise at home; not, perhaps, of corn, which, however, can be got quite as good and cheap from abroad, nor of mutton, for sheep to be kept in health require an occasional run over a wide stretch of poorish land, but far more of beef, pork, milk, butter, kitchen vegetables, poultry, and eggs. To object that Sillet and Beere "are not and never were peasant farmers," because, forsooth, they are men of exceptional



character, is surely to beg the whole question in very arbitrary and invidious fashion. In what are they exceptional? Not in industry or thrift. In those respects we may boldly say that we "have within the realm ten thousand good as they." What really distinguishes them from their fellows is their modicum of agricultural science; but this would be no distinction beyond sea. Sillet has told us what are the rules he follows. Here they are, and they read like extracts from the Flemish code:—

"'Never let the cow out of the cowhouse; carry her food and water to her. Do not keep a foot of ground on pasture. Dig your land, instead of ploughing it. Throw away nothing that can be turned into manure. Keep your land well weeded. Collect a large dunghill. Curry the cows once a day' (Sillet curries his pigs as well as his cows). 'Carefully collect rushes, potato-stalks, and weeds before they seed, for the cows' litter.' Sillet, moreover, grows beans between his potatoes, and wheat between his cabbages, dibbling the wheat eight inches apart, and reaps as much of it as if nothing else were grown there."

What is there here beyond the average British understanding? What that the Irish cottier could not or would not do if he were taught; and where the difficulty of teaching him? Professor Baldwin, who, as Chief Inspector of Agricultural Schools, has superintendence of a model farm at Glasnevin, of five acres, which is cultivated with spade and hoe by one man and one boy, and the gross produce of which amounts to eight times the rent, testifies to the results of an attempt made during Lord Spencer's viceroyalty to encourage small farmers by offering them prizes—results so remarkable as to persuade him that the same plan, tried upon an adequate number of peasant proprietors, might in ten years entirely revolutionise Irish agriculture. Nor will the Professor's confidence appear excessive if it be considered that each of the supposed peasant proprietors might serve as an agricultural schoolmaster, teaching his tenant neighbours by example; while, if popular treatises like Cobbett's *Cottage Economy* were introduced as text-books into the national schools, each of these latter might *ipso facto* be converted into an agricultural school, imparting the theoretical elements of an improved husbandry, which the scholars would subsequently have every inducement to put into practice.

As to one danger which there might seem to be peculiar reason for apprehending in Ireland, the latest evidence is, on the whole, decidedly reassuring. Among the witnesses examined by the Committee there is very general concurrence of opinion that the old tendency to excessive subdivision is fast dying out, and is even being replaced by a tendency towards consolidation. The peasant's standard of comfort has greatly risen of late years; "once he was content to live on a few potatoes, now the bread-cart calls daily at his door." Formerly, however small the father's holding, his sons, having nothing else to look to, eagerly seized upon each his fragment, albeit aware that he could not live and could only starve

upon it; now they have come to feel that there is no good to be got out of too small a bit of land, and prefer to seek their fortunes in America or Australia. Fathers, too, however little they may mind cutting up a landlord's land, don't like cutting up their own, preferring to leave it all to one of their children, and to portion off the rest. "I have not made my will yet," said Degnan, the fifty-acre freeholder already quoted, "because I don't want to die yet; but if I were to die to-morrow I should leave my whole farm to one child, charged with portions for the others." Moreover, purchasers under the Church or Land Act are strictly forbidden to subdivide until the entire price is paid, and many may be expected to die within the thirty odd years allowed for the payment, a period long enough to foster in their children habits directly opposed to the proneness to subdivision formerly generated by the improvidence of destitution.

The principal aim of these pages has been to show what abundant warrant Mr. Lefevre's Committee have for recommending further legislative action for the purpose of bringing about a moderate intermixture of small proprietors with the main body of small tenants; and, be it observed, it is only a moderate intermixture which their proposals are either designed or calculated to effect. Of the 20,000 or so of estates into which Ireland is at present divided, a very considerable proportion may charitably be assumed to be sufficiently unencumbered to be likely to continue in the same families for generations to come; and of the £800,000 worth of land, representing about 40,000 acres, which, on an average, come annually under the hammer, a full half may, in all probability, be bought by outsiders, ambitious of promotion to the squirearchy; while of the tenant purchasers, to judge from the experience of the last six years, more than a fifth will be occupiers of 100 acres or upwards each, only a seventh occupiers of less than 10 acres, all the rest occupiers of between 10 and 100 acres. The number, therefore, who would be called peasants in the usual sense of the term will not be large. No one, indeed, expects, and scarcely any one wishes, more than one in five of the smaller landholders to be converted into landowners by the operation of the Bright clauses; and whoever thinks this an excessive proportion should still recognise the necessity of accepting things as they actually are, and the wisdom of making the best of them. There are actually in Ireland between 500,000 and 600,000 small tenants. There they are, and cannot be got rid of. They can neither be raised to the height of the East Lothian farmer nor reduced to the old level of the Dorsetshire hind. Now, however prejudiced he be against the petty proprietor, every one must admit him to be a less objectionable animal than the equally petty tenant. *Cæteris paribus*, he is sure to be more active, more thrifty, better off in every way—a better husbandman, and a

better subject. To assist, then, a moderate proportion of Irish peasants to rise to the rank of proprietor would at worst be only to choose the less instead of the greater evil. If the experiment totally failed no permanent harm would be done. Things would, at any rate, be no worse than before; while, if its success corresponded with the hopes of its advocates, the result might be nothing short of the regeneration, social and political, of Great Britain's sister island.

Let me briefly recapitulate some of the gains involved in so happy a consummation. The meanest hind, seeing about him a series of stepping-stones by which he might gradually rise higher and higher in the social scale, would no longer ask wherefore he should give up whiskey and tobacco, or why, since he never could be better off than he was, he should not at once take Biddy. He would have motive enough for saving all he could out of his harvest money in order to buy a rood of land, and for going on working like a horse, and saving more and more, first to make the rood an acre, and then to multiply the acre by five, ten, and twenty. Yet, though saving, he would take good care not to starve himself. Paddy has quite enough of likeness to John Bull to prevent his doing that. He would be sure to improve his diet as he got the means, and, working better, in proportion as he was better fed, would get more and more out of his land. And in what shape would he get it? Well, in great measure, provided only he put in practice the agricultural science with which we assume him to have become tinctured, in precisely that shape in which the public most needs it. Sending to market at least thrice as many beasts as are as yet sent from any equal Irish acreage, our regenerated Irish peasants might bring down the price of meat from the extravagant height at which we are all grumbling to a point at which foreign importers would be unable to compete, and from which rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease would hold aloof. Here are social considerations coming so directly home to every one's business and belly that it might be superfluous to dilate on the political advantage of turning many myriads of law-breakers into law-keepers—nay, of obtaining in them an extra and unpaid police force.

I had hoped to be able to examine briefly the practical conclusions arrived at in the Committee's final report, and to contrast them with the bolder suggestions offered in a draft report submitted to the Committee by Mr. Lefevre, as Chairman, which, although rejected, was rejected by a majority of one only. Not having left myself space to do this, I am glad to find that my omission has been amply supplied by Mr. Lefevre, who has just reprinted both reports and prefaced them with an incisive commentary, in a pamphlet entitled "The Working of the Bright Clauses of the Irish Land Act,"<sup>1</sup> which no one interested in the subject should fail to read.

W. T. THORNTON.

(1) Dublin: Alexander Robertson.

## BURMA.

THERE are few things more extraordinary in the annals of the world than the history of our political relations with native princes in the East. In India the growth of British power was supported by a system of subsidiary alliances. When the old wars with Indian princes had been brought to a close, about the year 1818, the British Government found itself pledged to maintain the native powers in their respective territories. It guarded against their making war upon each other, or carrying on any political negotiations amongst themselves, excepting through the medium of its own political officers. It rigidly prohibited all communication whatever with any foreign nation, European or Asiatic. It put a stop for ever to an objectionable practice which had grown up during the eighteenth century, under which native princes had taken French and other European officers into their service, for the purpose of drilling their armies in the same way that the East India Company's officers had drilled the English Sepoys.

In dealing with Burma, no subsidiary alliance was ever contemplated. In the earlier years of British ascendancy, the King of Burma was always regarded as an independent sovereign, whom it was desirable to propitiate by any and every means in our power. This fiction of treating the semi-barbarian monarch as superior to the English authorities at Calcutta and Madras was kept up, with some exceptions, throughout the period which preceded the first Burmese war of 1824-26. During the interval of nearly thirty years which separates the first and second Burmese wars, there were no cordial relations between the two states.

The present state of political relations with Burma has no connection whatever with the old diplomacy of the eighteenth century. It belongs to an entirely new era; it has grown out of the second Burmese war, and is in fact the result of that war. In 1853 the King of Burma refused to sign any treaty, and the then Governor-General, Lord Dalhousie, finding that the King was impracticable, declared that he did not want a treaty; that a treaty with such a potentate would not be worth the paper on which it was written. He accordingly ignored the King, and by a notification dated Fort William, 30th June, 1853, issued his own proclamation of peace; annexing at the same time the valuable province of Pegu, and fixing on his own authority a parallel of latitude to be the line of frontier between British and Burmese territories. The consequence was, that the Empire of Burma, which had once commanded the greater part of the eastern coast of the Bay of Bengal, was reduced to the

condition of an inland power, and shut up in the upper valley of the Irawadi river.

The second Burmese war of 1852-53 was much more effective than that of 1824-26, but was unfortunately brought to a premature close. On neither occasion did we take due advantage of our conquest. In 1826, and again in 1853, it would have been an easy task to reduce the King of Burma to the condition of a feudatory prince, maintained by a subsidiary alliance, like the princes of India. Of late years the British Government seem to have awakened to a sense of their omission. They have striven to obtain by diplomacy in time of peace the commanding attitude of a paramount power in Upper Burma, which could only have been legitimately obtained by force of arms; and now a third Burmese war is by some considered imminent.

Since the death of the late King of Burma considerable anxiety has been caused by reports that several small forts, which within the last few years have been constructed at certain commanding points on the Irawadi river under the supervision of an Italian engineer officer, had been armed with guns, and that the new occupant of the throne had been surrounding himself with counsellors notorious for their hostility to the English. Later telegrams, too, conveying statements of further warlike preparations, and information that the Indian Government had, under the present precarious condition of affairs, thought fit to more than double the numerical strength of the military force ordinarily maintained in British Burma, together with sensational accounts of atrocities said to have been committed by the new *régime*, are certainly not, to those unacquainted with the Burmese, of a nature to allay the previous misgivings.

The late King, whose name when a child was Moun-g-lwon, but since his accession to the throne has been known by his royal titles only, it being a Burmese theory that the name of a king is too sacred to be uttered, is officially reported to have died on the 2nd October last. His death, however, is believed to have taken place early in the previous month, and to have been concealed by the Ministers in order that arrangements might be completed for securing the accession to the throne of the young Thee-bau Prince, the favourite amongst all the King's numerous sons of his chief surviving queen, the Alay-nan-dau Phura. She, since the death in November, 1876, of the King's principal queen and half-sister, the Nama-dau Phura, has possessed great power and influence.

On the 19th September a proclamation, purporting to have proceeded from the King, was published in Mandalay installing his "royal son," the Thee-bau Meng, Ieng-shé Meng, or Crown Prince, and describing him as "well versed in the Bee-da-gat thoon-bon," or three great divisions of the Buddhist Scriptures, and "having

completed his education by passing three first-class examinations with degrees of honour." On the same day that the proclamation was issued the Thee-bau-Meng took up his residence near the Hlwot-dau, or Supreme Court, situated within the Palace enclosure; and on the 2nd October, the declared date of the King's death, he removed to the Royal Palace, on the steps of which were assembled the Ministers of State, who delivered over to him the White Umbrella, the symbol of Burmese sovereignty—a ceremony equivalent to proclaiming him King.

The King's obsequies were solemnised on the 7th October, a fact which goes far to prove that his death actually occurred some time previous to its official notification. A King's body is always embalmed, and lies in state for, at least, a month, and it is very improbable indeed that a Burmese precedent of ancient standing was departed from in this instance. A description of the ceremonies connected with a Burmese royal funeral may be not uninteresting.

The funeral took place within the inner Palace enclosure, and the procession from the Palace commenced with seven large elephants with gold-plated castles on their backs, in which were placed lances and shields. These represented the paraphernalia of ancient times. Then came bearers of vessels and other objects symbolical of agriculture. A huge red catafalque containing an empty coffin borne on men's shoulders followed, and in its wake a band of musicians carried sitting on ornamental stands. After the band came the Chief Ministers of State, preceding two long lines of white-clad ladies of the Palace pulling, by means of ropes covered with white muslin, a truck on which the King's body was laid, sheltered by twelve large white umbrellas held over it by royal pages. The chief surviving Queen, the Alay-nan-dau Phura, was next to the truck, and as the procession passed on, a scarlet cloth which had been spread on the ground for the ladies to walk upon was rolled up. On the arrival of the truck in front of the enclosure round the pagoda built for the reception of the body, the ladies of the Palace and the Ministers took their seats in booths which had been erected for them. All were dressed in white, the mourning colour, without ornaments of any kind. After a short pause two lines of soldiers in red and green uniforms, armed with muskets and fixed bayonets, advanced from the Palace, and between them came the young King, clad in a garment entirely covered with small plates of silver, with a conical head-dress of the same material, and seated on a splendid golden throne borne by sixty bearers. Four maids-of-honour knelt, two before and two behind him, on a lower stage of the throne, with hands joined as in adoration. His procession halted in front of the pagoda gateway, where a long address in Pali was read to him, which concluded by

begging for permission that the obsequies of the late King might be proceeded with. This took about a quarter of an hour, when his throne was turned round, and he was borne back to the Palace.

When he had disappeared, the Chief Queen arose from her place, accompanied by her own immediate attendants and the Ministers, and the corpse, amid sounds of wailing, was placed in its coffin and carried within the funeral enclosure, and bricked up in the vault of the pagoda which had been prepared for it. No cremation of the body took place. Within the enclosure was placed an iron gilt grating resembling that of a cremation furnace, and around it stood bellows formed of large wooden tubes with pistons, usually employed to excite the fire on such occasions; but all these, it was stated, were only intended to be used symbolically.

The late King spent many years of his early life as a Buddhist monk, and in 1853 was suddenly taken from the seclusion of a monastery to sit upon the throne of Burma. In personal character he was amiable and kind, and according to his light, religious. His reign of over a quarter of a century was not disgraced by wanton atrocities and wild excesses, and he was less debased and corrupted by the absolute despotism which he was doomed to exercise, than any of his predecessors. In his anxiety, however, to increase his revenue, he established several royal monopolies and vexatious imposts, which rendered his financial system very oppressive, interfered with trade, and impoverished his people. He fully appreciated our power, which he attempted to counterpoise by sending embassies to several of the courts of Europe with offers to form treaty alliances. During his reign few misunderstandings of any consequence occurred with the British Government. Indirect opposition was occasionally shown to reasonable demands made upon him for the benefit of both countries; but when it was thought fit to advance these firmly he gave way, and was always most careful to avoid any possibility of an open rupture.

After the violent death of his brother the Crown Prince in 1866, the late King was averse to appoint a successor to the throne, and gave as his reason that he wished to avoid the danger of exciting a premature ambition in the young mind of one of his sons, and also of producing factions among his numerous children in opposition both to himself and his nominee. No law of primogeniture exists among the Burmese, and the King, who is the fountain of all honour, may appoint whom he pleases to succeed him. Shortly previous to his fatal illness it was believed he intended that his son, the Nyoun-yan Meng, should be his successor; but, if so, his wishes have been set aside by a Palace intrigue, or he was induced by his favourite Queen to change his mind in his last moments. The Nyoun-yan Meng has arrived at the mature age of thirty-

four, and is well known for his good disposition and moderate views. His accession would have given general satisfaction, and had he succeeded to the throne, he would probably have had a better chance of holding his own, than the comparatively speaking unknown youth who has become King.

Some days previous to the promulgation of the royal edict proclaiming the Thee-bau Meng Crown Prince, orders were issued in the name of the late King summoning all the royal princes to attend at the Palace. Many of them obeyed the summons; but some, dreading treachery, excused themselves on one pretence and another. Amongst these latter were the Nyoung-yan Meng and his younger brother, the Moun-ok Meng, who, on the receipt of a second message insisting upon their immediate attendance, took refuge with their families at the British Residency. The princes who obeyed the summons were all put under restraint at once, and the others who evaded it for the time have, it is believed, with the above two exceptions, all been subsequently arrested, and several of them put to death.

Great and repeated efforts were made by the Burmese Government to induce the British Resident, Mr. Shaw, to give up the two fugitive princes; but, having once given them the protection of the British flag, he very properly refused to do so; and on the 14th of November he succeeded in dispatching them by a British steamer to Rangoon, where they arrived safely, and were at once sent on to Calcutta. The Alay-nan-dau Phura, being under the impression that her favourite's throne was in jeopardy as long as the Nyoung-yan Meng was at large, was most anxious to obtain possession of the fugitives, and, it is said, was prepared to go any lengths to attain her object, even that of attacking the British Residency; but fortunately, owing to the wise counsels of the Prime Minister, the Keng-won Meng-gyee, its precincts were not invaded.

The two princes were fortunate in effecting their escape at the time they did, as at least one, the elder of the two, would in all probability have met the same fate at the hands of their half-brother as the Mekhra Meng and other more prominent of the late King's sons are reported to have done. It has been the invariable practice, even at the peaceful accessions of new sovereigns—and the people of no nation in the world are greater sticklers for precedent, or more conservative and tenacious of old customs than the Burmese—for every person who, it is thought, might possibly be dangerous to the rule of the new King, or obnoxious in any way, to be put to death. On the accession of the Pagan Meng, who was deposed by his half-brother, the late King, in 1853, he executed, amongst many others, his brother, the Prince of Prome, with five of his sons, and one of his father's queens, together with all their relations, and shortly



after that made a holocaust of another brother, the Taroup-mau Meng, with his family and all his household, amounting in number to upwards of one hundred persons. The late King had a great character for humanity, and fewer executions took place on his accession to the throne than had ever been known before; but still several princes and public officers were executed under his orders.

The late King had no sons by his principal queen, the Nama-dau Phura, or by the Alay-nan-dau Phura, and the whole of his numerous male progeny are by inferior wives or concubines. The Thee-bau Meng is nineteen years of age, and possesses in the fullest degree that curious combination of bounce and timidity so peculiar to the Burmese character. He has married the two daughters of the Alay-nan-dau Phura, who is believed to have been chiefly instrumental in placing him on the throne, and he is sure of her support; but the kingdom has been constantly exposed to palace revolutions: and unless he continues to be upheld by tried and practical ministers, such as the Keng-won and Ma-gway Meng-gyees, he is liable to be deposed at any moment, and another sovereign set up in his stead. He has undertaken the rôle of a reformer, or it has been assumed for him by his Ministers. It is a difficult part to play amongst so conservative a people, and outbreaks will doubtless occur. He appears to have already offended the priesthood, to whom the late King was most generous in his offerings, by reducing their allowances, and they consequently predict all kinds of unpleasant things which are to happen to him.

Besides the Nyoun-yan Meng, there are four other sons of the late King residing under our protection, namely, the Lem-beng, Meng-gon, Meng-gon-doing, and Moung-ok Mengs, all of whom have equal, and in the case of the two former, what may be considered superior claims to the throne, over those of the Thee-bau Meng; the Lem-beng Meng more especially so, as he is a son of the Kanoung Meng, the late Crown Prince by (if I mistake not) a daughter of King Tharawadi, and is therefore of royal blood on both sides. Moreover, on the late King's accession he entered into a solemn compact with the Crown Prince, who was his elder brother by the same mother, and to whose influence and exertions he chiefly owed his crown, to the effect that on his death the Crown Prince or one of his sons should succeed to the throne in preference to his (the King's) descendants. The Crown Prince was murdered on the 2nd August, 1866, by the Meng-gon and Meng-gon-doing princes, at the instigation, as they themselves state, of their late father, who regretted the powers he had delegated to his brother, and had become both jealous of and alarmed at his influence. This statement was emphatically denied by the late King, and how far it may be true is difficult to determine. The late King certainly gave some grounds for the

allegation by shortly afterwards imprisoning the whole family of his late brother, and suddenly ordering them off to execution, from which fate, with the exception of the eldest son, the Pudyne Meng, who had been executed before the reprieve arrived, they were only saved by the interposition of the then British Resident, Major Sladen.

The young King may be said to have commenced his reign well, by remitting several monopolies, and no less than twenty-seven different vexatious taxes which tended to paralyse the commerce of the country. Retrenchments have been made in some departments of the State, and divers expensive government works, such as the building of the great Yan-geng-doung pagoda, have been stopped. Portions, too, of the Crown jewels have also, it is said, been sold or mortgaged, in order to raise money to pay up long-standing arrears due to the Palace guards and other troops, and the salaries of government servants who have been discharged.

A special envoy has also been despatched to the Viceroy with a view, it is believed, of renewing the first two clauses of the treaty which, after some lengthy negotiations, I concluded with the late King on the 25th October, 1867, and proposing additional favourable terms to this treaty. The two clauses in question refer to a uniform import and export duty of five per cent. *ad valorem* on all goods and merchandise passing between British and Burmese territory, and were to remain in force for a period of ten years, commencing from the first day of the Burmese year 1229, corresponding with the 16th April, 1867. Since the expiration of that period, though no alteration has been made in this duty, a disinclination was shown to enter into any further fixed arrangement.

He has, too, but not until after some considerable discussion and demur, conceded the right of the British Government to place a military guard of adequate strength at the disposal of the Resident at Mandalay, and the Assistant Resident at Bhamo, the details of which are in course of amicable arrangement between the Resident and the Ministers. This measure is necessary not only to uphold the position of these officers in external marks of rank and consequence, but also to protect them from personal risks, from which, by nature of the frequent émeutes that occur in the country, the Burmese Government may sometimes be unable to guard them.

There would appear, therefore, to be every inclination on the part of the new King and his Ministers to introduce reforms into the government of the country, and to meet our wishes in every possible way in their power, and our position at Mandalay ought to be stronger now, if judiciously taken advantage of, than ever it has been since we have been brought into contact with the Burmese. The people of Burma, however, are altogether a different people from the inhabitants of India, and form a total contrast to them in

habits and disposition, and we may possibly labour under some difficulty in fully realising the advantages of our position from the fact of our being represented at Mandalay during a critical period by an officer who is entirely unacquainted with the manners, customs, and language of the people, and of the court to which he has been accredited, and is consequently at the mercy of an interpreter. Mr. Shaw is undoubtedly a very able man, well versed in the ways and languages of Central Asia, and it seems strange to have transported him to a new sphere, where his former experiences, so eminently useful in his own field of action at Leh and in Kashgar, are utterly thrown away.

With so sensitive and impulsive a people as the Burmese, no forecast of events can well be made. The King's knowledge of the facts that five of his brother princes are living under our protection, any one of whose claims to the monarchy could be supported if we thought fit, and that we are infinitely the stronger of the two, should enable us to gain peacefully any ends which the force of circumstances require him and his people, in their own interests, to yield to our more advanced civilisation. But, as stated above, much depends on the manner in which the situation is gauged, and the shape in which our preponderating influence is used. As regards the King of Burma taking the initiative in any aggressive movement against our territories, the contingency seems to me so improbable, that it is not worthy of any serious discussion. We have already taken from the Burmese the most valuable half of their territory; and from what they have previously experienced, they have much greater cause to apprehend such an event from us, than we from them. They have some reason, therefore, for making preparations against us accordingly.

The Burmese have no regular army, so to speak. In case of war an army is formed from levies raised in the different districts of the kingdom, the officials of which become their commanders. No distinction exists between civil and military services, and treasurers and judges are expected to take command of troops. Such an army is a mere rabble. It is without any discipline or military virtue, and is formidable only to the petty tribes and nations in the neighbourhood. The late King occasionally employed Europeans to drill his guards at Mandalay, but a very small amount of success attended his efforts in that direction.

A chronic desire exists in a certain section of Anglo-Indian society for the annexation of the remaining portion of Burma. A collision is very easily got up; but any attempt at further extension of our territory in that direction, especially with our hands full as they are at present, would be a mistake both politically and financially, and is intensely to be deprecated. Lord Dalhousie in his Notifi-

cation before alluded to, in speaking of the Province of Pegu, remarked that "we hold in the easy grasp of our hand the kernel of the Burmese Empire." And this kernel, I may remark, with its extraordinary commercial and producing activity, pays more than double the amount of revenue, rated on population, of that provided by any Province or Presidency of India, and after all provincial expenses are paid yields a handsome surplus to the Imperial exchequer. Its line of frontier with Burma, though far from being a "scientific," or theoretically perfect one, has its outposts connected by electric telegraph, and is easily accessible from its base both by rail and river. If this frontier is once passed, we could not pause before we had annexed the whole country up to the borders of China, involving a very heavy expense, both in the present and future, and bringing us into contact with tribes of various types inhabiting those extensive mountain regions, who would not improbably prove as difficult to manage as those on our North-West frontier.

It would, too, be full of possible danger and complication from our being brought into immediate contiguity with China, on a portion of her frontier where she has already shown extreme jealousy, and has more or less baffled our endeavours to push our commerce. Moreover, China has always considered Burma to be a tributary, and the country is so described in their various histories. The Kings of Burma, though pretending to deny their feudatory condition, have always been in the habit of sending embassies with presents of various kinds to the Court of Peking; an act which in eastern nations is always considered as a confession of inferiority.

ALBERT FYTCHE.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

If it were wanted practically to reinforce the arguments advanced in these pages a month ago, in favour of the establishment of an equitable and politic understanding between English and Irish Liberalism, it would be enough to point to what took place in the House of Commons on the night of March the 13th. There were supplies to be voted and estimates to be passed, yet for five long hours nothing was done because Mr. O'Donnell arrested the dispatch of public business by an elaborate and prolix speech on a motion of which he had previously given notice, and which was followed by a considerable discussion. There was absolutely nothing reprehensible, nothing not perfectly legitimate and respectable in Mr. O'Donnell's contention. His argument was for the most part strictly logical, and the answer of the Attorney-General for Ireland was only so far successful as it was an evasion of the real issue. In Scotland, and to all intents and purposes in England, denominational education is subsidized by the State. What is done for the varieties of dogmatic Protestantism in these parts of the United Kingdom we refuse to do for Roman Catholicism in Ireland: and the sole explanation which is given of this refusal is that the alleged impartiality of the Imperial Government in the matter of educational assistance to all forms of Christianity in Ireland is much better for the general interests of a mainly Roman Catholic population.

It is not, however, with the abstract justice of Mr. O'Donnell's demand that we are concerned, but with the effect which the inconvenient contingency of such demands, supplemented by such discussions as that of a fortnight ago must have upon the dispatch of Parliamentary business. The Resolution which the House of Commons has passed against obstruction is manifestly inoperative. There was nothing of obstruction in the technical sense in the debate on Mr. O'Donnell's motion; none the less it answered the purpose of obstructing. Such obstructive incidents we may always expect so long as an understanding is not arrived at between the leaders of the Irish members and the leaders of Parliament. As we showed last month, the only English politicians who can hope to conduct successfully such negotiations are the chiefs of Liberalism. Mr. Butt's health has apparently improved; but his illness has been much more serious than was generally known, and it is exceedingly improbable that he will again take an active part in the affairs of St. Stephen's. We are thus brought back to the question: What specific *modus vivendi* will English Liberalism devise with Mr. Parnell or Mr. Mitchell Henry, or whoever else Mr. Butt's successor

may be? Sir William Harcourt made a carefully prepared speech on the night of Mr. O'Donnell's motion, which was evidently intended as a bid for an Irish alliance on the educational basis. "As the Government," he said, "has established in England denominational education, he thought it would be unfair on the part of a Protestant majority to refuse to Irish Catholics denominational education. When the Irish members brought forward clearly their views on the demands of the Irish Catholics respecting University Education, he would assure them those views would receive his most careful and respectful attention, because he did not think any one would avoid seeing that the university education given in Dublin and the Queen's Colleges had not answered the practice." It seems more probable that the best opening for joint action is in a very different quarter; the solution of a problem at once pressing, popular, and purely secular—the tenure and transfer of land.

Much also that has taken place in Parliament during the past month is suggestive of the helplessness of English Liberalism for decisive political action, so long as it does not command the co-operation of Irish Liberalism. Two motions for increasing the electorate of the United Kingdom, by very different methods, have been considered in the House of Commons. Yet widely different as are Mr. Trevelyan's resolution for assimilating the county to the borough franchise, and Mr. Courtney's motion for bestowing the political suffrage on widows and spinsters who are ratepayers, they are not without certain general resemblances. Both are proposals for the lateral rather than the vertical extension of the franchise. An existing principle is applied to a wider area in each instance; in neither, so far as the qualification for the political suffrage is concerned, can it be said that a new principle is introduced. Both again are equally characteristic of certain dominant political tendencies of our time. There are three distinct movements which in the sphere of statesmanship and government may on all sides be observed. One is the movement in the direction of the simplification of political force; the second is in the direction of its economy; the third, closely allied to the second, in the direction of its organization. Government is rendered more simply, as undoubtedly it is more purely democratic, by the growing concentration of executive power in a single elective assembly, which will ere long faithfully represent the entire people. Again, political force is organized and economized by the agency of those processes which are now in general operation, and which have as their aim the extraction of an increased amount of political energy from the body politic, and its exercise with a guaranteed maximum of effect. The latter is the object of all such organizations as the Caucus, all associations whose purpose it is to secure that the suffrage of the individual voter shall mean more, and shall obtain more. The former quality is equally inherent in the two causes respectively identified.

on the present occasion with the names of Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Courtney. Mr. Courtney aims at causing whatever there may be of political virtue innate in, or acquired by, the women of England, to make its influence felt upon the government and legislation of the people. Mr. Trevelyan would do the same thing for the peasantry of England.

Curiously enough, one of the strongest arguments, and one of the least insisted on in the House of Commons during the debate of Tuesday, March 4, in favour of the establishment of household suffrage in counties, may be discovered, *mutatis mutandis*, in an expression of Mr. Trevelyan's most able and resolute opponent, Mr. Courtney, applied by its author to the political emancipation of female ratepayers. Those of the rural labouring class who, in one sense, want the franchise least, are those who, in another sense, want it most. In other words, if the household vote is not an imperious political necessity to the English peasant, he should no longer be permitted to dispense with its stimulating and educating force. It may be just as desirable, as Mr. Lowe on a memorable occasion said, to instruct our political masters, but as power is the product not of paralysis but of activity, so it is hopeless to expect that the English working classes in country districts, sunk as they are in apathy and stupor, will take the initiative in improving their squalid and miserable lot. In some parts of England the Agricultural Labourers' Union has impressed the peasant with the consciousness that he too is a man; and in these cases, though he may not have a political vote, he still has some shadow of political influence, for he contributes to the manufacture of the opinion of those who have votes. But too generally the peasant's most hopeless and pathetic characteristic is his mute acquiescence in the scandals and hardships of his lot, for no other reason than a depressing conviction of his impotence to cure them. Even the admirably law-abiding nature of the English proletariat has its darker side, and there is too often but a single step from loyal toleration to supine and ignoble surrender. The labourers of rural England will never insist on the stamping out of the crying evils of their state till they perceive that this resistance is a guarantee that the claim will be conceded. Thus the signally practical temper of the English masses—which contrasts, as Mr. Frederic Harrison has more than once shown in the pages of this Review, in so striking a manner with the temper of the French *ouvrier*—is apt to be carried to a really mischievous excess.

Let us give an instance of what we mean. Speaking with a not inconsiderable as well as recently gathered knowledge of the state of the peasantry in most parts of England, we say without hesitation that vice, iniquity, and misery of which none who have not actually witnessed them can perhaps have an adequate idea, will never be effectually grappled with till a measure analogous to the Artizans'

Dwellings Act, which is permissive in towns, is made compulsory in counties. Some of the larger landlords and the chief corporations holding territorial property fully recognise and admirably perform the duties of their position. On such estates there is no lack of good cottage accommodation for rural labourers and their families, but elsewhere a state of things exists under which health and decency are impossible. If such plague-spots are to be removed, it is the victims of the moral and physical pestilence who must make their voice heard. That is what they can never do in a Parliament in which the sole members for the communities of rural England are the nominees of the landlords and farmers.

The very nature of the motive which chiefly impels the Government to resist Mr. Trevelyan's demand is itself a strong argument in favour of a measure based upon his resolutions. Although the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to avoid the trouble of a second division, accepted Mr. Lowe's amendment, which condemns in perpetuity an extension of the franchise, he has in his speech said, "We do not lay down any finality under all circumstances." In fact, the principle of Mr. Trevelyan's reform is one which the Tories are compelled conditionally to concede. The main reason why they shrink from embodying this principle in a Parliamentary Bill, is their natural dread of alienating the farmers, while it is the circumstance that a County Suffrage Bill is advocated by the Liberals which makes any reconciliation between themselves and the farmers impossible. Among the many strong points which Mr. Trevelyan made in his speech, two were noticeable: the first that Mr. C. S. Read, on the occasion of his recent electioneering campaign in North Norfolk, addressed himself exclusively to the farmers; the second that all the measures which have been of late years framed for the amelioration of the condition of the agricultural working-classes were designed by the members, not of counties, but of boroughs. It is Mr. Fawcett who is the real author of the agricultural portions of the Education Act; Mr. Cowan who has insisted on the extension of the Artizans' Dwellings Act to villages; Mr. Mundella who has been instrumental in abolishing the last remnants of the truck system. Nor were some of Sir Charles Dilke's arguments less forcible and suggestive. In the first place he showed that in many small borough constituencies, where the population is partly agricultural, the labouring classes are systematically pauperized by landlords—lured into receiving parish relief on the plea of illness, in order that they may be disqualified from voting. Secondly, he dwelt upon the fact that in addition to faggot voters, "two hundred leading Conservative partizans, many of them members of that House, who had sham qualifications in half the doubtful counties," squires, rectors, and vicars were in the habit of securing a vote for their dependants—"clerks, sextons, coachmen, gardeners, farmers,



mole and rat catchers"—by helping them to inhabit a house the rent of which came up to the ten-pound standard. It may, of course, be said that these abuses would not be entirely rooted out by the introduction of household suffrage. But they would at least be minimised, and the rural labouring poor would be stimulated to activity by the knowledge that their efforts were not necessarily foredoomed to failure. With the exception of the plea of inopportuneness put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the familiar arguments characteristically urged by Mr. Lowe, no attempt worth consideration was made to meet Mr. Trevelyan's absolutely overwhelming case. Lord Claude Hamilton's reply was even more unsuccessful and ineffective than might have been expected. If, he said, Mr. Trevelyan's proposal were carried out, the representation of classes would be at an end, since the immense majority of members of the House of Commons would be those sent to Parliament by working-men. Now, as a matter of fact, working-men are at the present time a majority of the electors in borough constituencies; therefore, the borough constituencies predominating in the national electorate, Lord Claude Hamilton's apprehension ought to be in process of fulfilment already. But the true and sufficient answer to all such forebodings is that you can no more divest powerful orders of political influence, in whatever constituency they may come, than you can rob knowledge of the power it brings; that classes are not represented the less thoroughly, provided only they have a force and importance of their own, because their representation is indirect.

While the assimilation of the borough and county franchise is simply a question of time, it is more doubtful whether a period can be fixed within which the political emancipation of women will become an accomplished fact. If Parliamentary battles were won by dint of hard argument, Mr. Courtney's motion would have been carried by a decisive majority on the seventh of this month. One of Mr. Courtney's contentions has been anticipated, in its application to the case of the agricultural labourers. Most of the objections brought against the proposal were pervaded by two distinct fallacies. Thus a great deal of claptrap was talked about the unsexing of women, of the revolution which the measure would work in the relations between the two sexes, and of much else to the same effect. Now there would be something in these criticisms, if the bill of which Mr. Courtney advocates the introduction were to be charged with compulsory effect. If any rate-paying spinster or widow were to labour henceforth under the legal obligation of taking part in public life, there would be plenty of reason to anticipate the prospect with alarm. But if on no other ground than that it were permissive, Mr. Courtney's proposal should recommend itself to the Government. Either

women are or are not capable of discharging those political duties which devolve upon ratepayers of the male sex. If they are, well and good; if they are not, the mere fact that the polling-booth is open to them will make no difference. If women are as a class indifferent to the franchise, they need not exercise it when it is given to them, and the only voters in petticoats will be the ladies who are now occupied with the assertion of their rights by agitation, and who will scarcely find the act of recording a vote with the intellectual consideration it may involve a much more arduous process. Two views were taken in the discussion as to the results of the admission of this new element into the Constitution. On the one hand it was urged that the difference it would cause would be unappreciable, on the other hand that it would be immense. If the former opinion is realised, what will have been done must be harmless; if the latter, then it would have been obviously unjust—any longer artificially to suppress so powerful a force.

The most serious attempt to resist the motion—for the representative of a Cabinet whose chief has distinctly given in his adhesion to the principle of the resolution, could scarcely venture to do more than urge the familiar non-urgency plea—was made by Sir Henry James, in a speech which obviously bristled with sophisms. There is something truly ridiculous in the endeavour to rest a serious political argument upon a piece of sentimental commonplace which finds its expression in the diary of the Sovereign, and which was written twenty-seven years ago. Again, Sir Henry James hardly addressed himself at all to the criticism of the proposal which Mr. Courtney really made. The motion, he said, if translated into a parliamentary act, would have the effect of placing nine hundred thousand more women on the political register than men—these figures representing the excess in the population of the feminine over the masculine element. But then that calculation includes the total of adult women married and unmarried, while Mr. Courtney carefully excludes the former. If we ask what, as a fact, would be the probable political result of such a measure as Mr. Courtney would like to see introduced, we may almost venture to say that it would be absolutely fatal to the political enfranchisement of the whole sex. It may even be said that we should not so much have enfranchised the woman *quâ* woman, but *quâ* ratepayer. In other words, we should have done for her precisely what we shall, sooner or later, do for the agricultural householder. Now in this matter to extend the area of a rate-paying franchise is really to strengthen its foundations. The principle would be laid down, and in such a manner as would give it every guarantee of permanence, that the only qualification for the political franchise which the Constitution of England recognised was payment of rates, irrespective of rank, age, or sex.

A third not unimportant domestic debate which has taken place in the House of Commons during the month, is that on Sir Wilfrid Lawson's motion for the regulation of the liquor trade. It is necessary to describe it in these general terms, for, when we once get into the region of technical phraseology, we encounter confusions at every turn. The distinction was drawn in the House during the discussion between the principle of local option, and the principle fundamentally embodied in Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Resolution. Lord Hartington declared himself in favour of the former, but felt compelled to oppose the latter, on the ground that it was wide enough to cover the Permissive Bill. The expression, local option, was made use of by Sir Wilfrid Lawson himself, and there could be no reason why those members of Parliament who advocate the system which the words denote—a system, that is, under which the inhabitants of a district or their representatives are empowered to regulate, but not entirely prohibit, the traffic in intoxicating drinks—should not have given it their support. Sir Wilfrid Lawson, however, insisted on showing his hand a little too plainly, declared that he went beyond local option in the qualified sense in which Mr. Forster and others gave him their vote, and, not content with entrusting localities with the power of controlling public-houses, as to numbers and hours of opening, wished to give to them the right of closing such houses altogether. It seems to us that it will be well if the Liberals will seriously consider whether it is desirable generally, in such cases as these, to act upon the principle that dictated the course followed by Lord Hartington. When party politics are in their present state, when many matters which may form the subject of future legislation are in the air rather than are ripe to be legislated on, it must be expected that motions and resolutions to which the name of abstract is given will be not infrequent. Now if in each instance that such a proposal is brought forward Liberals are to consider, not so much the general object at which it aims, but the specific legislative intent which they think they can discern in its author, the difficulties in the way of Liberal union will be indefinitely increased. It is true that Sir Wilfrid Lawson's motion "covers" the Permissive Bill, and that to the Permissive Bill grave exception may be taken. But then it covered also the most harmless form of local option. Is there any sacrifice of conviction involved in travelling a certain distance with a man, because your way happens up to that point to be his? If not, why hesitate to go with a gentleman, who is entertaining and may be useful, one mile because there is in your mind an apprehension that he may force you to go with him twain?

In the same way, it is difficult to see why Liberals, or for the matter of that Conservatives, should persistently decline to vote for an inquiry into the merits of Home Rule. Such an investigation might have one of two results. First, it might show that

the idea is a fantastic and impossible craze; secondly, it might suggest certain improvements in the machinery of local government which, once supplied, would go far to silence the Home Rule cry. In neither instance could any mischief be done. As regards Sir Wilfrid Lawson's motion itself, the arguments against the Permissive Bill have been stated with sufficient frequency and sufficient force. It is conceivable that it may prove that the Permissive Bill in some shape or other would be the legislative outcome of local option. It may be urged that once the inhabitants of any district were empowered to say how many public-houses they would have, and subject to what rules, they would claim the right of abolishing them altogether. On the other hand, the capricious temper of local discretion might assume a different form, and the inhabitants, instead of reforming public-houses off the face of the earth, might claim indefinitely to multiply them. How multifarious are the difficulties by which the question is beset is admitted very unreservedly by the Committee of the Lords on Intemperance in their report just published, the first, and not the least practical, of whose recommendations is that Mr. Chamberlain's modification of the Gothenburg system shall be allowed a trial.

Foreign affairs have not of late attracted much attention in Parliament, and the only evidence of its existence that the Eastern Question has given in the House of Commons has been in a debate on the nature of our relations with Egypt, the result of which has satisfied nobody. The day is rapidly approaching when we must take a decision on three points of vital importance. First, when the third of next May arrives, and the evacuation of Eastern Roumelia by the Russian troops is due, what arrangement do we, as signatories to the treaty of Berlin, intend to insist upon for the preservation of tranquillity in the Balkan peninsula, or do we intend to insist on any? Secondly, what are to be our permanent relations with Asia Minor, of which we have already assumed the Protectorate? Thirdly, what with Egypt? So far as concerns the first matter these facts are plain—the inhabitants of Eastern Roumelia will only be driven by arms and massacre to acquiesce in the active renewal of Turkish rule. Apparently the best thing that could be done would be to appoint as their ruler a Bulgarian prince. But this would involve the amalgamation of the two Bulgarias or Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, and as a consequence the surrender of the sole perceptible fragment of "honour" which Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury brought back from the Conference at Berlin. It, therefore, becomes necessary to provide for the military garrisoning of Eastern Roumelia for an indefinite period. It is not known that any steps have been taken towards the composition of a force for this purpose. All that we do know is, that the future of Eastern Roumelia and the evacuation of it by the Russian troops have been

the subject of diplomatic communication between the Russian and the English Governments, and that Lord Salisbury has addressed what is called a spirited dispatch to Prince Gortschakoff. About this latter document two remarks are to be made. In the first place, it is noticeable that it was written before the Zulu war had become serious. In the second place, Prince Gortschakoff's answer to it is so complete, that some colour is given to the report that the main object of Russia in publishing it was to give Europe the benefit of the Russian reply. The one point for which Russia contends is the necessity of preventing the outburst of bloodshed and violence in the Balkan peninsula—if by an international force well and good; if not, by the continuance of the Russian troops beyond the date stipulated by the treaty of the 3rd of May; if by neither, then by the revision of the treaty in a manner agreeable to the national aspirations of the Bulgarian people. Is England prepared and able to dictate terms which Russia will be compelled to adopt, and which the other European powers will approve? The answer to the question may be found in the responsibilities that we have on our hands in South Africa, in Afghanistan, and in Burma.

To this list Egypt might well be added. It is a curious thing that the present Government can engage in no transaction which does not bring with it a strong suspicion of the Stock Exchange. The relations that have been developed between England and Turkey in Asia are at bottom pecuniary, and whether our protectorate of Asia Minor is to be a sham or a reality is a question of pounds, shillings, and pence. It is the same with the African dominions of the Porte. We have informally entered into partnership with a prince who wants our money, but does not want our management. The position is exactly that between father and son in *Les Fourchambault*. The son saves the father from ruin, and then insists on having a ruling voice in his domestic and commercial affairs. It is true that the Cabinet is anxious to keep itself in the background. What the Khedive does, or what Mr. Rivers Wilson does, is really, so says Sir Stafford Northcote, no affair of her Majesty's Government, who lent Mr. Rivers Wilson to Ismael Pasha, but will do nothing more. The Chancellor of the Exchequer denies that he or his colleagues have any thought of protecting the interests of the bondholders, and protests that Mr. Rivers Wilson is only the Khedive's servant. But in Egypt he is known to be more than this; and it is significant that Mr. Vivian, our able consul-general at Cairo, should have been recalled because he is notoriously hostile to Mr. Wilson's policy, which is to starve the local government of the Khedive, in order that foreign successive claims may be met. These are not relations that can long be maintained, and there is something which, it might be thought, would be peculiarly distasteful to English feeling

in the strikingly unheroic and insincere attempt to secure the ascendancy of British influence in the Delta, and to checkmate France.

As regards the domestic affairs of France, the problem of parliamentary government is gradually working out its own conclusion. The political drama of the last few weeks consists of three acts, of which the first is the Amnesty Bill—a measure not, indeed, as absolute and complete as M. Victor Hugo and others would have it, but one which, by effacing all legal record of the offences of a large number of those implicated in, and punished for, the excesses of the Commune of 1871, is a very material concession; and the last the series of incidents connected with the Report of the Impeachment Committee. Midway between these comes the affair of M. de Marcère. By the resignation of the late Minister of the Interior a further step has been taken in the direction of the establishment of a political doctrine without the recognition of which representative government is impossible. That doctrine is the solidarity of the cabinet or the executive with the majority of the Chamber. The extreme discontent felt through France in the Prefecture under the administration of M. de Marcère was perfectly natural. The subordinate agents in the internal Government of the country were the nominees of the Empire, and in many cases made no effort to conceal their Bonapartist sympathies. The administration of the French Home Office was the object of much attack and the cause of some suspicion. Both suspicion and attack culminated in the onslaughts of the *Lanterne*, based as these were upon revelations, many of which were not wanting in circumstantial evidence. It is now clear that a grievous mistake was committed in prosecuting the paper, before the inquiry was instituted into the conduct of the police. The conviction which M. de Marcère obtained against the *Lanterne* availed him absolutely nothing, and when the investigation which should have preceded it was set on foot, it was conducted in a manner which was the assured earnest of the minister's fall. At every step M. de Marcère hesitated, showed his uneasiness, changed his tactics. At first, indeed, some few signs of vigorous resolution were not wanting. Then succeeded all those symptoms which mark the negation of statesmanship. He insisted upon a secret inquiry, and the members of the Committee retaliated by threatening resignation. Then he supported M. Gigot, his prefect of police; then he threw him over. Finally he accepted his retirement. Even thus it was not impossible that M. de Marcère might have vindicated himself by a clear, able, and manly speech in the Assembly. But when M. de Marcère was put upon his trial before his peers by M. de Clemenceau's motion, he broke down completely. He entirely failed to justify his policy. He went into pitiful apologies of his private character. He had been accused of implication in financial transactions and speculations of a not too creditable kind. Nothing,

he protested, could be more false, and no more honest man lived in France than he was. This was not to the point, and his assailant, M. de Clemenceau, put the matter with irresistible and relentless force when he said, "Are there no law courts? Let us discuss here matters of public policy, not private reputations." After the result of this debate, M. de Marcère had, of course, no alternative but to resign. The mistake was that he did not resign at a much earlier date, and that his colleagues did not take the initiative of urging upon him the expediency of doing so. On the other hand, they might have supported him. As it was, they did neither the one thing nor the other, and displayed a weakness which brought them perilously near contempt.

Nor can the result of the debate on the impeachment motion be said to have given back to M. Waddington's Cabinet the prestige which the Marcère episode took away. Of the entire justice of the Report of the Committee which recommended the public arraignment before the tribunal of Republican France of the Duc de Broglie, General Rochebouet, and their colleagues, there cannot be a shadow of doubt. It is impossible to stigmatize in language too strong the black and deliberate villany of which these men were ready to be the instruments. They were involved in a conspiracy of which the object was the triumph of reaction, though the cost should be the peace and happiness of France. The question was not whether the policy of impeachment was righteous, but whether it was expedient, and the Cabinet decided that it was not. It is necessary in estimating the strength of M. Waddington's Government to eliminate from the total of its supporters upon any given occasion all members who belong to any section of the Right, and in the division on the impeachment motion the Cabinet only had a majority of twenty-five of the Left. It is thus clear that there is now always a risk lest when any important political question presents itself, the Cabinet may be in the actual minority so far as the adhesion of the Left is concerned. There can be no security till the Cabinet and the majority really cover the same ground. At the present moment, while the majority ranges between the extreme Left and the Left centre, the Cabinet goes from the Left centre to the Right centre. Thus while the Republic in France possesses most of the elements of stability, the Government which is in power for the time does not. Hence the repeated rumours of M. Waddington's resignation, and his replacement by M. Gambetta. The former event may be witnessed at no distant date, and may perhaps be precipitated by the discussions on M. Jules Ferry's Education Bill. But nothing is less probable than that M. Gambetta will accept the post of Prime Minister till the proportions which the office of President of the Republic is to assume in the future, stand out in clear relief from the mist and vapour with which the political atmosphere is now charged.

*March 25, 1879.*



THE  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

---

No. CXLIX. NEW SERIES.—MAY 1, 1879.

---

THE FRENCH REPUBLIC AND THE CATHOLIC  
CHURCH.

It has never been a secret that the final establishment of the republic in France would be immediately followed by active measures in the sphere of national education. Activity in this direction inevitably, in England as in France, touches the passions and interests of the old teaching order. If a system of education is to be national, it must be organized; and if it is to be organized, it must cease to be sectarian, for the resources of the greatest sect are inadequate to the task, while to lend even to the greatest sect the resources of the State is inconsistent with the political ideas of modern times. It has been clearly foreseen, therefore, that the new republic would open its history by what could not be other than a bitter and prolonged struggle. The certainty of this was, of course, one of the causes of the hostility of the clergy to the republic, throughout the last eight years. They were told with abundant candour what they had to expect. "The clergy," said M. Clemenceau, "must be taught that it is necessary to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and that *everything is Cæsar's*." There was hardly an arrondissement in Paris where salvos of applause did not greet orators who said that they would not tolerate the priest in the family, in the school, or in any public function outside of the church. The further the speaker went at the meetings of the triumphant party, the louder the thunders of approval. In not a few places in Paris the spirit of Hébert or Chaumette re-appeared in full force. "What I want," said one citizen, "is the elimination of the churches." "Yes, yes," cried the audience, "no more churches! No more *jésuitières*! Down with all that!"

All this might have been neglected as the common form of the

VOL. XXV. N.S. . . . . Y Y



Parisian democracy. It was impossible to neglect the utterances of M. Gambetta. It was impossible, too, to misunderstand them. In his famous speech at Bordeaux this is what he said :—"I tell you that the urgent practical task of your representatives ought to be almost singly that of the organization in all degrees, from the point of view of the schools, from the point of view of programmes of instruction, from the point of view of means of study, from the point of view of finance—ought to be to assure the constitution of national education; and if we work in concert to begin a reform of this kind, there is no other which ought to draw us away, because the others can wait." At Lille he went more directly to the mark. "They have dared, yes, they have dared, under the name of liberty of superior instruction to pass a law, the label on which is calculated to cheat simple people. Liberty has nothing to do with it. The law is an instrument of division. . . . The pupils who follow the new instruction will be brought up in the hatred of modern France, and the hatred of those principles of justice which form the base of our national laws. They will be brought up in their own country as if they were foreigners; it is *émigrés* and foci that will thus be formed in the midst of us; you will have sown a germ of discord and division, which, added to all the others, must inevitably lead to catastrophe and ruin." At Bordeaux, again, he branded the law that thus allows of the establishment of free universities in the hands of the clergy, as "a law of division, a law of retrogression, a law of hate, a law of disorganization, a law of moral anarchy for French society."

Both parties then were aware what would follow the final defeat of the conspiracy of the sixteenth of May, the resignation of the Marshal, and the accession to power of the sincere republicans. The great educational campaign, of which our generation is perhaps not likely to see the end, would at once open. The new government lost no time in introducing their measure. If that measure had been very much more moderate than it is, it would probably have served equally well as a signal for conflagration. And the conflagration is now at red heat. In every newspaper the battle is raging. It is not merely the question of superior instruction that raises the dust and fury of conflict. In every corner of the vast field where clericals and liberals meet, the struggle goes on. In one place it is a light skirmish between two handfuls of free lances; in another it is the heavy shock of great bodies of men, with masterly organization and in full panoply. Passionate declamation and trivial anecdote, venomous satire against persons and magniloquent appeal to principles, the slang of the street, the thunders of the pulpit, the heavy drumming of philosophic text-books, the

shrill whine of the Black, the rasping clamour of the Red, fill the air with an uproar that stuns and confuses. Any casual sheaf of journals from the first kiosk on any day you please shows what is going on every day.

Here it is a tale of some great lady on the occasion of her daughter's civil marriage, behaving with such studied levity and indifference towards the Mayor, that that functionary shut up his books, and told the astounded party to come again that day week—a lesson which the journalist would like to see taught with the same emphasis to all who dare to flout the authority of the State, when its exercise happens to be disagreeable to the Church. Another paper narrates how the daughter of a prominent Radical had been married the day before. The invitations to the civil ceremony were issued in the name of the father and mother of the bride, but the appended invitation to the religious ceremony was in the name of the mother only. When the bridal party came out from the Mairie, and went on in procession to the church, the father ostentatiously quitted them, and strolled under the neighbouring arcades, poisoning the joy of the day, desolating the heart of his own daughter, exposing his wife to pity and satire, parading with the Satanic pride of the infidel, the hateful discord of a family divided against itself! The next sheet has a couple of columns dealing at large with the insolence of the clergy, and elaborating the malicious hint that as they draw their stipends from the State, they will do well to govern themselves accordingly, or else their pay will be stopped. The *République Française*, so important a journal because a few weeks ago it belonged to so important a man, celebrates Easter by an article of which the central proposition is the round declaration that “religion is every day falling into deeper and deeper discredit.” To this, on the other side, the *Constitutionnel* cries out that to insist on France singing the *Marseillaise*, and yet to denounce everybody who says a Paternoster or a Credo, as a bad citizen and an enemy of the State, is odious, grotesque, brutally inconceivable; it confounds good sense, and passes all belief; it makes one blush for our age of liberty and progress; it renders the future suspect, it sows hatred and terror; it kindles an atrocious and hideous civil war in the hearts and minds of men. If we turn to the more strictly ecclesiastical journals, that is a very old story. The Jesuits use very much the same language because they are not to be allowed to open schools in France, as the Pope used the other day because he is not allowed to shut schools in Rome. They borrow all the phrases about liberty, tolerance, persecution, martyrdom, and the dependence of truth upon freedom, as if every form of intellectual freedom were not explicitly condemned in their own Syllabus. M.

Ferry seldom escapes with an easier name than Nero or Diocletian, and he is most often Pontius Pilate. The republic is an orgy; liberalism is a hydra; interference with the illegal congregations is materialism, naturalism, and atheism, and the revolution has been from the very beginning the daughter of Satan; *potestas tenebrarum*, the mysterious and accursed power of darkness. The Archbishop of Aix turns his cheek to the smiter in this way:—"Who are these men," he cries, "who claim thus to mould your children in their image and likeness? You know, my very Christian brethren, the grotesque origin which they attribute to themselves in order to decline the honour of having been created, like common men, in the likeness and image of God; and yet perhaps they flatter themselves too highly in connecting themselves with I know not what apish ancestry. To judge by their designs and their acts, one would be rather tempted to take them for the descendants of those to whom our Lord Jesus Christ said; *Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.* . . . Noble sons of Provence, will you suffer that your little ones shall be violently taken from their heavenly genealogy, to confound and destroy them for ever in the infernal genealogy of the demon?" The liberals retaliate with an odious list of the shameful crimes for which priests and congreganists have been convicted within the last six months, and they add a map of the departments of France with the non-authorised establishments marked upon it, and described as the Clerical Phylloxera, the deadly insect that devours the young shoots of the vine. The publisher of a radical paper was sentenced a few days ago to a fine and eight months of imprisonment for writing of Jesus Christ as the "Rabagas of Golgotha."

It would, no doubt, be wrong to mistake the Parisian journalist for the French people. But all this can hardly be a mere blaze of straw. Though the peasant is master of France, the feeling of Paris counts for an immense force; and that feeling is anti-clerical with an aggressive intensity to which in no department of controversy in England is there anything at all approaching to a parallel. It is the dominant impulse, the decisive test, in the politics of the capital. When a man is a candidate for a seat in the city council, he does not merely say that he will keep the rates down; he assures the electors that he is strong for secular education, and will vote for such improved instruction for girls, that they may no longer from ignorance and superstition be the counsellors of the politics of religious egoism at the domestic hearth. This is the kind of thing that is for ever glaring in all colours on the walls of Paris. There are five protestant members of the ministry, but it is no secret that it is not they who encouraged the introduction of the bill. The clergy

know very well that it is no protestant enmity with which they have to deal here, but the old, resolute, pertinacious, inappeasable hatred of Paris and the great towns.

If it is no straw fire on the one side, still less is it a straw fire on the other. The bishops called for a great manifestation of the Christian conscience of France, and their call is responded to by a vast cloud of petitions from every district in the country. The word is passed to fulminate against the bill from the pulpit, and fifty thousand priests fall to as one man, and beat the drum ecclesiastic. Their hearers have heard it all more than once before this, under monarchy and empire as loudly as now, and they know that in spite of all, so much religion as they need for the ordering of their lives still remains for their service and edification. But the perturbation is immense. It breaks that tranquillity which the ordinary Frenchman cherishes more than he cherishes any given form of government. Some observers are incensed against the bill because, they say, it will inevitably estrange the priests in Alsace-Lorraine from France, and it is the priests who keep alive in the breasts of the conquered population the flame of love for their old brethren and hatred for their new masters. Others more practically urge that the Senate will throw out the bill, the effect of which will be not only the troublesome ordeal of a ministerial crisis, but what is far more mischievous than that, a fatal breach in the harmony between the Senate and the Chamber.

The weight of such an objection as the last cannot be overrated. We can only suppose that the government have taken it into account, and for reasons that are not at present intelligible, have thought it their duty to face the risks. It is easily conceivable that there are ends of such moment, that a statesman might well think it his duty to pursue them at the cost even of the furious turmoil that now prevails in France. What we want to know is whether the particular measure which has been made the occasion for this demonstration of mutual hatred and contempt between the two parties, deserves sympathy in its principle, and approval for its present expediency. We have not now to discuss the question, wide-reaching and important as it is, whether it is expedient or inexpedient that the government of a country should meddle with education, either by conferring grants of money or by assuming a share in its direction and control. Nobody wishes to deprive the government of its sovereign right of testing the competency of those on whom it confers diplomas. It is assumed, also, in France that the State may, or is bound to, take a part in the regulation of instruction in all its degrees, and therefore we can only study French affairs profitably if we take this for granted, and start from the same point at which

a French critic would begin. The issue is whether the State is, or is not in education to have a monopoly. And it is important, again, to realise that it is not an issue between a cast-iron system of State instruction, and a hundred rival societies, experiments, and fruitful developments of individual ingenuity and endeavour. It is not a battle between system and individuality, but between two cast-iron systems, in each of which there is exactly as little room for the originality of individual minds as in the other. It is an obvious mistake to carry the analogies of England or the United States to a country with the ineradicable centralization of France, on the one hand, and the centralization of the Catholic Church on the other. It may be true, and it is true, that one of the main objects of every French statesman, after the consolidation of the republic, ought to be to weaken this traditional system, to loosen its hold upon the daily life and mental habits of the nation, and to prepare the way for the final establishment of a healthier system. But it would be folly and political fatuity to act as if this process had already been accomplished, and under the peculiar circumstances of France there are many excellent reasons why the process should not be hurried. In England, if you take away a given function in the department of national education from the Government, you do not know to whom it will fall instead of the Government. But in France you do know. In France, whatever is taken away in education from the State is given to the Church.

It is important to understand exactly what it is that the French Government, at this moment, propose to take away from the Church, or rather from certain members and classes whom the heads of the Church have taken under their special patronage. The Liberals are very anxious to assure us that this is a political question. The Government, no doubt, sincerely wish and intend it to be so. But we cannot always please ourselves as to when a question shall be political, and when it shall be something else. In all the controversies of national education, it happens to suit the convenience of the clerical party both in France and elsewhere, to insist that it is not a political question but a religious question. This is what makes the present agitation in France so serious. For a statesman to touch a religious question, Thiers said in 1871, is simple madness. The bill of M. Ferry, however, is capable of being regarded, as it was framed, not as an anti-religious measure, but as really in the domain of secular politics, and really prompted by considerations of secular statesmanship. We ought to begin then by understanding exactly what the bill proposes, and its relations to historic legislation on its own subject.

Under the first Empire the Government university had a complete monopoly of education in every degree, primary, secondary, and superior, all equally. The system was described as the Government applied to the universal control of public instruction. There was no education possible except in the State and by the State. Even the seminaries known as ecclesiastical secondary schools were governed by the university; they were organized by it, regulated under its authority, and instruction was given exclusively by its members. The Restoration lightened the yoke in a slight degree; still the Government retained a strict monopoly. The constitutional ministry of 1830 made the first breach by granting liberty of instruction in the primary schools. In spite of vehement efforts on the part of such powerful champions as Montalembert and Lacordaire, the movement went no further. Secondary and superior instruction remained the monopoly of the Government. Then came the revolution of 1848, and one of the articles of the constitution of that memorable year declared that "*Instruction is free.*" In 1850 the important Falloux Law was passed. This measure opened the right of teaching, secondary as well as primary, but not superior, to every Frenchman, subject to certain conditions as to age, moral character, and diploma. There was only one class of restriction. A man who had undergone punishment for specified offences against the law could not become a teacher. The State still retained the monopoly of superior education. It was not until 1875, as we all know, that the law permitted any body of French citizens who chose, to establish faculties for the purposes of university teaching. As the law now stands, therefore, instruction is in all its three degrees free to all French citizens under the conditions already named in the Falloux Law.

The law now, in the words of the fourth clause of M. Ferry's bill, "recognises two kinds of schools of superior instruction. *a.* Schools or groups of schools founded or maintained by the communes or the State; these take the name of universities, faculties, or public schools. *b.* Schools founded or maintained by private individuals or by associations; these can take no other name than that of free schools." There is a sharp sting, however, in what reads like a plain statement of fact. The newly established faculties are no longer to be called universities. As if, say the bishops, the Church which first invented the name, and once covered the whole of Europe with universities, had not a right of possession, and for that matter the law of 1875 expressly recognised this right.

The important clauses of M. Ferry's bill are the first and the seventh. The first is as follows:—"Les examens et épreuves pratiques qui déterminent la collation des grades ne peuvent être

subis que devant les établissements d'enseignement supérieur de l'Etat." That is to say, the free universities which were called into existence by the legislation of the last Assembly, are to retain their teaching power, but are to lose their examining power. The present examination for degrees in the case of the private students is that of the *jurys mixtes*. The examiners are appointed partly from the public university, and partly from the free or private faculty. Under the bill, the representatives of the free university are to examine no longer, and the decision of the competency of every candidate alike is to rest with the government examiners. The opponents of the system that has been in operation since 1877 dislike it partly on political ground, and partly on an educational ground. They dislike it because it infringes what has for a century been an organic maxim in France, that inasmuch as the possession of a degree acts and is taken as a solemn guarantee of competence and responsibility by the national government, therefore the State is entitled or bound to take exclusively into its own hands the measures by which competence and responsibility are tested. This conception, whether sound or unsound, does as matter of fact prevail more or less in all European countries, and it is not seriously contested by any practical group. It is the view of such a man as M. Renan, who is known to approve of M. Ferry's first clause, though he disapproves of the seventh. In the second place, they contend that as a matter of open and notorious fact, not only in France but in Belgium, the certificates of the *jurys mixtes* mark a lower standard of proficiency than those of the government university.

On the other hand those who defend the present system, pronounce it to be indispensable to the existence of any free faculties whatever. M. de Laveleye, who has watched the mixed system in operation in Belgium, his own country, states the case against M. Ferry's first section as follows:—"If the pupils are compelled to present themselves before official teachers, if no representative of the free universities is there to protect them, then they must evidently be in a position of great inferiority relatively to the pupils of the official university, who will be examined by their own teachers. It is clear that he who settles the examination, settles the teaching. The youth of the country will be forcibly absorbed by the official university. Those who follow the lectures of professors whose teaching will be the object of suspicion, would be exposed to great and constant risks of repulse.<sup>1</sup> The result of this clause of the bill will

(1) This argument from so competent an observer is worth the attention of those English Liberals, who contend that Irish Catholics ought to be amply contented if the pupils from their own college are allowed to earn their degrees from a board of examiners appointed by the Government.

be to kill the free universities. Relying on the equity of the legislature, the free universities established themselves and won the confidence of a great number of families. Considerable interests had become involved, which are all overthrown and annihilated in order to restore a monopoly. This monopoly will reduce all consciences and all minds to one dead level through all generations." So much for the two opposed opinions on the first clause. It is a further grievance of the clerical party that the Minister so changes the constitution of the academic council, as to put the seal upon the sepulchre in which he intends to bury free instruction. The council was formerly composed of men representing a great variety of institutions, the Cour de Cassation, the Institute, the College of France, the Superior Council of Agriculture, and so forth. The new council, on the contrary, designed as it is to protect the restored monopoly of the State, is described as chosen almost without exception from the professors of the university.

The seventh clause is a much more serious matter:—

*"Nul n'est admis à participer à l'enseignement public ou libre, ni à diriger un établissement d'enseignement de quelque ordre que ce soit, s'il appartient à une congrégation religieuse non autorisée."* It is said that this clause is likely to be made even more widely restrictive when the report of the committee on the bill is laid before the Chamber; but we may discuss it as it stood in the original draft.<sup>1</sup> The principle of restriction is definitely stated, and it is on the principle of restriction that the discussion turns. The reader will notice that though the bill is a bill on superior education, and in the other clauses only affects superior education, the restriction of this clause covers all the three orders of instruction.

Now it is a point of capital importance that the congregations from whom it is now proposed to take the power of teaching in schools, are not authorised by the law. Most English criticism of the bill seems to have made somewhat too light of this. To thrust it into the background, is to hide one of the keys to the discussion. The legitimist monarchy was as firm and as definite as the Republic can ever be, in denouncing those who unite to live under statutes that have never been communicated to the government and have never been approved in the form for such cases prescribed, as entering into such unions in contumacious and direct contravention of the laws.

(1) According to the amended proposals, no member of a religious congregation will hereafter be permitted to give instruction, either in public or private, unless the congregation of which he is a member shall have been specially authorised to teach. It will not be sufficient that the congregation to which he belongs is one of the legally recognised congregations; it must be further specially authorised to teach.



Not only was the Society of Jesus abolished by special edicts in the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI., but at three different dates subsequently general laws suppressed all religious associations of men in France. Later laws made provision for such associations, principally for purposes of charity, and of elementary instruction in schools for the poor. In these capacities they exist within the legal order, and go about their business in tending the sick, and teaching the children. But it was only permitted to them to form their societies upon terms, and with these terms it is impossible for the Jesuits to comply. That famous body exists in France, but it exists apart from the law, and without the assent of the law. It cannot now, and it could not any more under the monarchy of the Restoration, buy, sell, acquire, possess, or be a party in a court of law. It was not a republican, but Portalis, the minister of Charles X., who went on to argue that buying, selling, possessing, and being a party in a law-suit, were far less conspicuous ways of calling the attention of the government to a violation of the laws, than publicly to direct the greatest schools in the country. The State, he said, was much more keenly interested in knowing and authorising those who presented themselves to form faithful subjects and good citizens, than those who only claimed the rights connected with corporate property. Hence the decree of 1828, while Charles X. was in full power, formally interdicting both the control of educational institutions, and the function of teaching in them, to any and every person "belonging to a religious congregation not legally established in France." In 1845 the same law was re-discussed, and again deliberately proclaimed.

In what sense, however, does a French Jesuit contravene the law? Lawyers of the clerical party boldly contend that though there are statutes declaring religious communities of men incapable of certain rights that belong to other corporate bodies, yet there is no text which makes the existence of a religious community of men a legal offence, carrying with it to individuals the incapacitating consequences of such offence. If it were otherwise, they say pertinently enough, why should M. Ferry need a new law? They go on to say—and very edifying it sounds on the lips of the party of the Syllabus—that to establish affiliation with a religious community as a legal offence, would be to commit an unconstitutional attack on that liberty of conscience which has been solemnly stated and restated in every constitution since 1789. We may listen with some impatience to pleas for liberty of association from the party which is on all possible occasions the resolute foe of every form of association except their own. And it is difficult to see why a member of the International should be liable to prosecution, while a member of a society whose

chief lives at Rome or Florence, and which has affiliated branches in all parts of the world,—the Black International,—escapes scot-free. But the fact that the law against the Jesuits, Dominicans, and the rest, has not been applied, and that they are not turned out of the country or otherwise punished, gives an equivocal and suspicious air of injustice to a project which strikes them with a new and penal restriction. To begin at this time of day to re-inflct a disqualification which had been abandoned, is certainly on the face of it an unwelcome retrogression. At the same time, it is absurd to cry out against the renewal of a disability which has existed for the best part of the last hundred years,—under the empire, the legitimist monarchy, the constitutional monarchy,—as if it were some novel and tyrannical invention of the new republic.

There is another point on which English opinion may easily be led into a mistaken sympathy with the French clericals. We are only too familiar in our own struggle for national education with the unscrupulous misrepresentations of the sectarian party, and it is not surprising that the same devices should be used in the fiercer struggle in France. We are led to believe that the bill will drive religion out of the schools. With characteristic confusion of mind—to give them the benefit of a charitable construction—the clerical party are protesting shrilly against the separation of religion from education. How? Because in certain cases lay teaching is being substituted for congreganist teaching. This is done in the case of the primary schools by the action of the municipal councils through the *préfets*. But this is an entirely different thing from separating secular and religious instruction, for the simple reason that the lay teacher is as much bound to give religious instruction as is the congreganist teacher! At present lay and congreganist teaching are on the same footing. If the Catholic fathers of families are in a majority in the commune, they are free to choose congreganists for teachers. The freedom is said to be even abused. Prejudice, habit, the influence of the mother, the frequent bait of a large gratuity,—all these agencies, we are told, decide the municipal councils only too often to establish the congreganist system. But this is not from any preference for religious instruction. That is equally assured, as the law now stands, in the lay schools. That a section of the liberals are working,—as English liberals will again work when interest in improving our system revives,—for the relegation of religious teaching to religious ministers in their own sphere, is quite true. But that does not touch the present controversy.

It always assists us to understand the scope and prospect of any measure, if we discover that there are men of consideration who will

accept its general object and go a certain way into its methods, but stop short of complete approval. Such men are by no means always in the right ; on the contrary they are very often in the wrong. But their view is instructive, especially in the case of another country, where a foreign observer needs all the help that he can get, to realise the true force and bearing of things, apart from the slippery illusions of phrases and abstract principles. Now it is agreed by many of those—including the orthodox Protestants—who most warmly condemn the bill of M. Ferry as unjust, inexpedient, and inopportune, in excluding a class of citizens from the rights of citizens, that the government might safely and wisely have done three things, all of them tending in the same direction towards a curtailment of clerical usurpations. First, they are right in resuming for the government not only the exclusive function of prescribing the conditions of examination for degrees, but the exclusive right of appointing the examiners. Next, they say, it might properly have insisted that the government should take upon itself the office of systematically inspecting the establishments belonging to the unauthorised congregations. It is difficult to understand clearly how inspection of this kind could have come to anything. The inspection could never be close and frequent enough to suppress the distillations of that indirect influence which is what the liberals are really aiming at. The only sanction, again, at the disposal of a government, from whom a school asks nothing save the permission to exist, would be termination of its existence, and it would be less trouble to close all such schools in gross by an act of legislation, than to close them in detail by acts of administration. Even if the report were designed to be a mere naked deliverance, to which neither the directors of a school nor the parents of the boys in it need pay more attention than they might think fit, is it not certain in the highly exacerbated state of feeling which is chronic in such matters, that the directors of the school would set down a hostile report to republican malice, that the parents would believe them, and that probably in some cases directors and parents would not be very far wrong in so believing? A third change, which it is said by the moderates that the government might legitimately have pressed, is the abolition of Letters of Obedience. A letter of obedience is a document given by bishops to women, and entitles the recipient to dispense with a further passport, to travel half-price by the railway, and to teach in the congreganist schools. This instrument is said to be grossly abused, as perhaps considering the nature of bishops and of women we might expect that it would be grossly abused. It is given to women so ignorant that they can barely read or write, and they do not even teach the girls in the schools how to sew or knit. Their sole business is to immerse the poor little creatures in the

prayers of the church, and to inculcate upon them the most grovelling articles of belief. No person whose sense is not overcome by party-spirit would deny that a privilege of this kind should be withdrawn, and that the same certificate of capacity which is exacted from a teacher in a government school should be exacted from all other teachers.

On these points, then, there is little difference of opinion among the kind of Liberals who answer in France, say, to Mr. Playfair in our own country. There are men, and men of eminence, like M. Laboulaye, who wish the Catholic liberty of examining for degrees to remain as it is, but there is no considerable political group among the Left who cling to this privilege. If these changes would have sufficed to conciliate moderate opinion, it is asked, why not have been content with them?

On the whole there is no serious complaint against the secular teaching of the Jesuits. The partisans of each side no doubt endeavour to disparage the attainments of the other. The *XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* rakes up a provincial paragraph to the effect, that the director of a congreganist school in the south knew his geography no better than to answer in an examination that Cette is a port at the mouth of the Gironde. The *Univers* promptly retorts by reminding its enemy that one writer in the organ of compulsory and secular instruction has made the Volga flow into the Baltic, and another had supposed the Bormida to be in Egypt! And so forth. But this is merely part of the game. The most that their enemies seem to be able to say is, that in the schools of the religious orders too much attention is paid to comfort. The boys are better tended, better fed, better trained in those maxims and habits which in grown-up men we call knowledge of the world. All this is assumed to be so much taken from solid study. But the evidence is slight, and the conviction does not strike one as very deep even in those who use this among other and weightier arguments. The Jesuits have no scruple, and this is to their credit, in resorting to teachers who are not Jesuits, when such teachers are more efficient than members of their own body. One of the most successful schools in Paris, which prepares admirable pupils for Saint Cyr and the Polytechnic, belongs to the Jesuits; but they have always sought the best teacher wherever they could find him, whether Catholic or freethinker. It is characteristic of what one must call the blind hatred that reigns on both sides in France, that an eminent Radical to whom an English visitor mentioned the great success of this school, promptly explained it by the treachery of the authorities of Saint Cyr and the Polytechnic: all the official classes were favourable to the clericals, and no doubt the chiefs of the French Woolwich and Sand-

hurst habitually let the teachers of the *Ecole des Postes* beforehand into the secrets of the examination papers!

It is not, however, generally true that parents send their sons to the schools of the unauthorised associations, because the secular instruction is particularly good. There seems to be two reasons for the comparative popularity of these schools. First of all, they are cheaper. The celibacy of the teacher makes his requirements fewer, he is willing to content himself with something less than would be necessary to a man with a family. Besides this, there are legends of private bounty on an immense scale, which enable the schools to sell their instruction below cost price; but one cannot help suspecting that there may be some exaggeration in estimating the effect of this element. Secondly, there is a slight social advantage on the side of the Jesuit schools. The small Legitimists of the provinces always send their sons to them, and so it comes that the upper middle class, who like to think of their children sitting on the bench with the son of M. le Comte and M. le Marquis, send them also to the Jesuits. The English reader, who knows the eagerness of the new rich to send their boys to Eton, not for education, but for social tone and the chance of scraping acquaintance with a lord, will understand all this readily enough. But there are other considerations, of which he will scarcely hear without a smile. The Jesuits not only keep a keen eye in after life upon a pupil, whose promise has excited their interest, and push him on in his business or profession; they are also an *agence de mariage*, skilful and influential brokers in the great market of young men and young women, and their favour is thought an excellent way to a good match.

What is the real objection in the minds of some of the strongest and coolest men in France to the interference of the religious orders in national education? What at bottom is the consideration that commends the new law to responsible statesmen? For we ought not to forget that it by no means originated with a pack of journalistic firebrands, and that it is ardently approved by more than one powerful man, who is neither doctrinaire nor fanatical Voltairean. The sovereign argument of the political chiefs who approach the matter from the purely political side is that which we quoted at the outset of this paper from the speeches of M. Gambetta. To allow the Orders to teach, and the bishops to direct faculties of superior education, is to invite the division of the nation into two. That half of the nation which is instructed in the Government schools will imbibe one set of ideas, and the half which is instructed in the ecclesiastical schools will imbibe another set of ideas, the contraries of the first. The two great groups will grow up to speak different languages, will be animated by mutually hostile aspirations, will not love the

same country. They will hate one another as Orangemen and Papists hate one another in Ireland. Is not this, we are asked, exactly what has happened in Belgium? In Belgium superior education is free, and the government universities and the ecclesiastical universities are on an equal footing. The result is the most distracted country in Europe. Belgium is in a permanent state of civil war, which would inevitably end in the violent disruption of its whole political system, if it were not in some sort held together by the safeguard of external Powers. We are reminded of what was said by a Belgian statesman to a writer in these pages a half-dozen years ago:—"We thought that to found liberty it was enough to proclaim it, to guarantee it, and separate Church from State. With pain I see that we were mistaken. The Church, trusting for support to the rural districts, is bent on imposing its power absolutely. The large towns, which have been won over to modern ideas, will not give way without a struggle. We are drifting to civil war, as in France. We are already in a revolutionary situation. The future before my eyes is big with storms."

Why, they say, should the course of things run differently in France? There too the influence of the Catholic priesthood is enormous, as anybody may see for himself, who does no more than count up the legacies and donations conferred on ecclesiastical establishments and religious congregations.<sup>1</sup> If the men who opposed Federalism ninety years since were right, it cannot be wrong to oppose with might and main this profounder destruction of the integrity of the country that is going on before our eyes in our own day. Federalism meant no more than the political independence of various sections of the land; but what France has to confront now is a peril that goes infinitely deeper than mere political separatism, a peril that means fierce moral dissension, anarchic hatred of citizen for citizen, a severance of a great nation of brethren into two camps of furious and irreconcilable

(1) These donations and legacies are only valid on condition that they have been authorised by decree of the President of the Republic in the Council of State. The official report which has been published as to the decrees submitted to the Council of State shows the extent of the gifts and bequests made during the five years between 1872 and 1877, distributed as follows:—

Congrégations religieuses	16,340,544 f.
Paroisses	26,929,138
Evêchés	5,134,899
Cures	3,190,059
Séminaires	2,426,327
Ecoles secondaires ecclésiastiques	1,153,856
Chapitres	253,209
Maisons de retraite	203,157

Total . . . . . 56,351,189 f.

That is to say, about two millions and a quarter sterling in all.

foes. It is the dragon's teeth of Cadmus that liberty permits the church to sow throughout France.

The force of such considerations as these, nobody will be likely to deny, who has reflected on the conditions and destinies of the Catholic societies of Europe and South America. There is a real peril, but the question between us and the French government turns on the way in which it should be met. It cannot be met in all Catholic countries in the same way, and there is no common canon of political criticism that will rule each case. The Falk Laws, for instance, are on a different plane from M. Ferry's law, because Dr. Falk was imposing restrictions of a disciplinary and other kinds on a paid and privileged Church of the State, and I for one have never been able to see that a paid and privileged Church has any business to complain, if its pay and privileges are granted on conditions. M. Ferry, on the other hand, imposes a restriction on a class who neither receive nor ask anything from the State, except to be left alone. But if the two sets of laws were more alike than they are, we should still have to take into consideration the different histories of the French and Germans, the different conditions of their populations, the different relations that have subsisted between the government and the clergy in the history of the two countries; and it might appear that restrictions were right and expedient in the one case, which would be neither right nor expedient in the other. Belgium, again, stands distinctly within historic conditions of its own, and there are some observers who think that the Liberals of that country lost their last chance when they were cut off from Holland.

But France is not Belgium. In spite of divisions so intense that they sometimes might almost make one suspect that the moral anarchy which her statesmen dread has already come upon her, her people have historic traditions, economic interests, an incomparable vivacity of intelligence, a constant accessibility to ideas, which might be trusted to protect them for the next century, as they have done in the last, against the new invasion of superstition and bigotry. If the ecclesiastical influence grows, it is at least due to voluntary adhesion. If parents choose to send their sons to schools under ecclesiastical direction, there must be an attraction of some kind in such schools, and what the Government ought to do is not to drive out the teachers and close the doors, but to bestir itself to provide higher attractions of its own. That the Republican Government is active in spreading its schools, we are aware. The budget for primary instruction has gone up since 1870 from eleven millions of francs to thirty millions. The budget for superior instruction has been more than doubled within six years. Building and equipment

of institutions for superior instruction are going on in Paris and the Departments, to the amount of two millions sterling. Fine laboratories are being built. New chairs are founded. The School of Medicine is being reconstructed. The School of Chemistry is nearly finished. The old Sorbonne will soon make room for a monument worthy of its imperishable name. Why not remain in this good way? Why not drive out the congregationists, if they are to be driven out, not by doubtful repression, but by vigorous competition?

There is a still more important question to which no proper answer is to be had. Is the sentiment of the French nation in favour of legislation of this kind, or against it? If the common sentiment is against it, then it is inconsistent with the principles of sound government, to force a law for which opinion is not only not prepared, but against which it is actively hostile. If on the contrary, the common sentiment is in favour of it, then the law is superfluous; it cannot be worth while to introduce legislation of the most violently irritating kind, merely to guard the nation against perils from which its own firm prepossessions would guard it independently of legislation. The law is either impotent, or it is unnecessary. We ask what it is that the Radicals dread in the teaching of the clericals, and we are told that what they dread and what they are fighting against is not the theology but the politics of the clerical teachers. We press the matter with importunity, and ask what it is that they are afraid of in the politics of the clericals. The answer is that they will bias the minds of their pupils against the republic, against civil marriage, in favour of the old aristocratic system, in favour of the old system of landed property. This is the best answer that is given by the most intelligent of the advocates of the bill. But what can be more incredible, more contrary to notorious experience, than that the son of the French peasant should lend an ear to direct maxims or privy inuendoes against the most sacred, ineradicable, violent, fundamental of all the assumptions of the daily life of his home! The peasant's strongest passion is his passion for his land, and his most inveterate hate is his hate against the memories of his old *régime*. Words are powerful, no doubt; but what words from priest or congregationist will avail against the overwhelming motives of independence, self-respect, material well-being, and against a type of living which has been finally developed by a century of habit and possession? What is odd is that the very people who thus profess to dread the sinister teaching of the priest and his allies, are most confident in assurances to their English friends that France is



Voltairean to the core; that the peasant will go up to his curé, ask him for what candidate he intends to vote, and then walk away to vote as matter of course for his rival; that there is no real Catholicism in France except among the old families and the upper bourgeoisie who imitate the old families, as in England our enriched dissenter turns Churchman; that the great mass of the people of France are willing to respect the priest so long as he confines himself to his functions at baptisms and funerals, on Sundays and at Easter, but that no creature in the world is so suspicious as the peasant, so jealous, so umbrageous, if the priest attempts by one hair's-breadth to cross the well-defined line that separates his business from that of other people. If all this be so—and nowhere is the state of things more graphically painted than by the clericals themselves when it suits them to deplore the fearful ravages of the Voltairean wolf in the field—then where is the peril, the urgency, the crying need to save the State?

Even if the peril is really so portentous, and if restriction be the right method, then M. Ferry's bill is inadequate. The conclusion is too narrow for the premisses. It is assumed that civil society is menaced in the very foundations of its fabric, that the current of ultramontaniam has burst its banks, and threatens to flood modern civilisation in a sombre deluge of superstition and absolutism. Education is only a pretext. Religious opinions are only a mask for politics, and for a war to the knife against civil and political laws. If this be so, the liberals cry, would it not be to show ourselves the dupes of mere words to remain inactive and disarmed before a foe whose dexterity and whose daring are equally unbounded? Opinion, we are told, does not demand persecution, but what it insists upon is that the government shall stand firm against the storm that has been let loose by an irrepressible and lawless order. But if so formidable a tempest is unchained, are not those right who ask whether you are likely to force the swollen torrent back to its bed by closing eighty-nine ecclesiastical colleges, and forbidding some seven thousand congregationalists—eight hundred of them Jesuits—from teaching? The heart of the clerical peril is not in the Jesuits or the unauthorised congregations. It is the authorised congregations with whom you ought to deal boldly, because the authorised congregations control primary instruction, and primary instruction is everywhere admitted to be within the exclusive functions of the State. The answer is that this will come in good time. At present the normal schools for training government teachers are wholly unequal to supply the required number. Action is already taken towards establishing a normal school in each department, but the process is still incomplete. It is

well known, too, that a strong and comprehensive measure is being prepared for making attendance at school compulsory. If you will only wait, say the ministerialists, you will see that we are not so impotent as to suppose our task to be finished with the indirect suppression of the free faculties, and the direct suppression of the unauthorised teachers. But then why have begun this immense process by a restriction which divides liberals, and incenses clericals, without any sort of proportionate gain?

Finally, there is a vital objection to the policy of the bill, and it is simply this. The law will inevitably be without effective operation. This is an objection so fatal, and so undeniable, that we are perplexed to understand how the able men who support the new policy can persist. An ardent and influential advocate of the bill confessed to the present writer, in the midst of a vigorous and unflinching contention on its behalf, his intimate conviction that its provisions would be evaded. Nobody doubts it. At the Catholic congress in Paris a few days ago a lay member, a lawyer, drew a pathetic picture of the unfortunates whom the new bill would strip of their profession and their livelihood, and send wandering over their native land, proscribed within the bosom of their own country. The thought of such a spectacle filled him with sombre thoughts and crushed his heart. But the orator soon took comfort. After all, the laws of the Church allow the Pope to relieve a member of a religious order from his vows. Many members, he said, will no doubt, be so relieved; and these will be the most devout, the most strongly attached to their order, in general the superiors of houses. They may have been Jesuits, Marists, Dominicans, Eudists, and so forth, but they will be so no longer. What can your new law say to them? Yet their spirit, methods, aims, all that you suppose you are going to annihilate, will remain exactly what they were. It has been said indeed that the government will meet this by exacting a declaration from every candidate who is a priest, not only that he is not, but that he never has been, a member of one of the non-authorised orders. But such a design can hardly be seriously maintained.

Then there are the Jesuits of the short robe—the laymen, with wives and children, living exactly as other men do. Nobody knows that they belong to the order. Is some inquisitorial process to be set up for compelling them to disclose their secret? It is impossible. Finally, the same ingenuity which enables the orders to evade the laws about property would infallibly serve to evade the proposed laws about education. In the case of property, *prête-noms* hold on trust. In the case of education, the superior of an establishment might cease, under the compulsion of the law, to preside over it, but

it would be easy to provide that he should be replaced by a successor who would obey the same inspirations and zealously carry out the same system, now erected into a point of honour, and consecrated by persecution.

All these considerations are so obvious, the flaws in the logic of the defenders of restriction and repression are so plain and decisive, that calm onlookers may well suspect that the bill is rather of the nature of a weapon of retaliation, than a well-considered attempt to reconstitute national education. We may understand the desire of a French liberal to be avenged on the party which for so many years has kept his country in an inextricable network of fiery perils. But this is a mere infirmity of the flesh. Hatred is not in the catalogue of a statesman's virtues. Party revenge is no fit passion for a man who loves his country. Let the clericals steal our maxims, but never let them tempt us into borrowing their methods.

EDITOR.

## WILLIAM KINGDON CLIFFORD.<sup>1</sup>

It is an open secret to the few who know it, but a mystery and a stumbling-block to the many, that Science and Poetry are own sisters; insomuch that in those branches of scientific inquiry which are most abstract, most formal, and most remote from the grasp of the ordinary sensible imagination, a higher power of imagination akin to the creative insight of the poet is most needed and most fruitful of lasting work. This living and constructive energy projects itself out into the world at the same time that it assimilates the surrounding world to itself. When it is joined with quick perception and delicate sympathies, it can work the miracle of piercing the barrier that separates one mind from another, and becomes a personal charm. It can be known only in its operation, and is by its very nature incommunicable and indescribable. Yet this faculty, when a man is gifted with it, seems to gather up the best of his life, so that the man always transcends every work shapen and sent forth by him; his presence is full of it, and it lightens the air his friends breathe; it commands not verbal assent to propositions or intellectual acquiescence in arguments, but the conviction of being in the sphere of a vital force for which nature must make room.

Therefore, when, being happy in that we knew and saw these things, and have received the imperishable gifts, we must unhappily speak of the friend who gave them as having passed from us, it becomes nothing less than a duty to attempt the impossible task; to describe that which admits of no description, and communicate that for which words are but blundering messengers. And perhaps it may not be in vain; for a voice which is in itself weak may strengthen the kindred notes that vibrate in other memories touched by the same power, and those we know to be very many. For this power, when it works for fellowship and not ambition, wins for its wearer the love of all sorts and conditions of men, and this was marked in Clifford by all who had to do with him even a little. More than this, our words may peradventure strike farther, though by no force or skill of their own, and stir some new accord in imaginations favourably attuned for the impulse. The discourses and writings which are now to be collected will indeed testify to the intellectual grasp and acuteness that went to the making of them. Clifford's earnestness and simplicity, too, are fairly enough presented to the reader, and the clearness of his expression is such

(1) This paper is part of the Introduction to the forthcoming collection of Prof. Clifford's Essays, shortly to be published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co.

that any comment by way of mere explanation would be impertinent. But of the winning felicity of his manner, the varied and flexible play of his thought, the almost boundless range of his human interests and sympathies, his writing tells—at least, so it seems to those who really knew him—nothing or very little. To say a word or two in remembrance of one's friend is but natural; and in these days excuse is hardly needed for saying it in public. But here this is the least part of the matter in hand. Personal desires and aims are merged in the higher responsibility of telling the world that it has lost a man of genius; a responsibility which must be accepted even with the knowledge that it cannot be adequately discharged.

Not many weeks had passed of my first year at Trinity when it began to be noised about that among the new minor scholars there was a young man of extraordinary mathematical powers, and eccentric in appearance, habits, and opinions. He was reputed, and at the time with truth, an ardent High Churchman. I think it was then a more remarkable thing at Cambridge than it would be now, the evangelical tradition of Sincon and his school being still prevalent. This was the first I heard of Clifford; and for some two years he continued to be nothing more to me than a name and a somewhat enigmatic person. In the course of our third year circumstances brought us together: it is difficult to remember the beginnings of a friendship that seems as if it must always have been, but to the best of my recollection there was nothing very sudden or rapid in our closer approach. I should assign about six months as the interval filled by the transition from acquaintance to intimacy. At an early stage in my knowledge of him I remember being struck by the daring versatility of his talk. Even then there was no subject on which he was not ready with something in point, generally of an unexpected kind; and his unsurpassed power of mathematical exposition was already longing to find exercise. I shall be pardoned for giving a concrete instance which may be in itself trivial. In the analytical treatment of statics there occurs a proposition called Ivory's Theorem concerning the attractions of an ellipsoid. The text-books demonstrate it by a formidable apparatus of co-ordinates and integrals, such as we were wont to call a *grind*. On a certain day in the Long Vacation of 1866, which Clifford and I spent at Cambridge, I was not a little exercised by the theorem in question, as I suppose many students have been before and since. The chain of symbolic proof seemed artificial and dead; it compelled the understanding but failed to satisfy the reason. After reading and learning the proposition one still failed to see what it was all about. Being out for a walk with Clifford, I opened my perplexities to him; I think I can recall the very spot. What he said I do not remember in detail, which is not surprising, as I have had no occasion to remember any-

thing about Ivory's Theorem these twelve years. But I know that as he spoke he appeared not to be working out a question, but simply telling what he saw. Without any diagram or symbolic aid he described the geometrical conditions on which the solution depended, and they seemed to stand out visibly in space. There were no longer consequences to be deduced, but real and evident facts which only required to be seen. And this one instance, fixed in my memory as the first that came to my knowledge, represents both Clifford's theory of what teaching ought to be, and his constant way of carrying it out in his discourses and conversation on mathematical and scientific subjects. So whole and complete was the vision that for the time the only strange thing was that anybody should fail to see it in the same way. When one endeavoured to call it up again, and not till then, it became clear that the magic of genius had been at work, and that the common sight had been raised to that higher perception by the power which makes and transforms ideas, the conquering and masterful quality of the human mind which Goethe called in one word *das Dämonische*.

A soul eager for new mastery and ever looking forward cares little to dwell upon the past; and Clifford was not much apt to speak of his own earlier life, or indeed of himself at all. Hence I am indebted to his wife and to other friends for what little I am able to say of the time before I knew him. William Kingdon Clifford was born at Exeter on the 4th of May, 1845; his father was a well-known and active citizen, and filled the office of justice of the peace. His mother he lost early in life; he inherited from her, probably some of his genius, and almost certainly the deep-seated constitutional weakness, ill paired with restless activity of nerve and brain, which was the cause of his premature loss. He was educated at Exeter till 1860, when he was sent to King's College, London, not without distinction already won in the University Local Examinations. At school he showed little taste for the ordinary games, but made himself proficient in gymnastics; a pursuit which at Cambridge he carried out, in fellowship with a few like-minded companions, not only into the performance of the most difficult feats habitual to the gymnasium, but into the invention of other new and adventurous ones. But (as he once said himself of Dr. Whewell) his nature was to touch nothing without leaving some stamp of invention upon it. His accomplishments in this kind were the only ones in which he ever manifested pride. When he took his degree there was a paragraph in *Bell's Life* pointing out, for the rebuke of those who might suppose manly exercises incompatible with intellectual distinction, that the Second Wrangler, Mr. Clifford, was also one of the most daring athletes of the University. This paragraph gave him far more lively pleasure than any of the more serious and academical marks of approval which he had earned. In after years

he did not keep up his gymnastic practice with anything like regularity; but he was with great difficulty induced to accept the necessity of completely abandoning it when it was known to be positively injurious to his health.

At King's College his peculiar mathematical abilities came to the front, but not so as to exclude attention to other subjects. Clifford was at various times and in various ways marked out for honourable mention in classics, modern history, and English literature. His knowledge of the classics, though he did not cultivate the niceties of scholarship, was certainly as sound and extensive as that of many professedly classical students; and, like all his knowledge, it was vital. If he made use of it for quotation or otherwise, it was not because the passage or circumstance was classical, but because it was the thing he wanted to illustrate his own thought. Of history he knew a good deal; he was fond of historical reading throughout his life, and had a ready command of parallels and analogies between widely remote times and countries, sometimes too ingenious to bear criticism. I doubt if he ever studied historical works very critically; it seems to me that he regarded history in a poetical rather than a scientific spirit, seeing events in a series of vivid pictures which had the force of present realities as each came in turn before the mind's eye. Thus he threw himself into the past with a dramatic interest, and looked on the civilised world as a field where the destinies of man are fought out in a secular contest between the powers of good and evil, rather than as a scene of the development and interaction of infinite and infinitely complex motives. This, indeed, in a meagre and far cruder form, is essentially the popular view; the sort of history upon which most people are still brought up divides men, actions, and institutions into good and bad according to the writer's present notions of what might and ought to be, and distributes blessing and cursing without more ado. Only Clifford, accepting to some extent the popular or pictorial way of looking at history, took on most questions the unpopular side, and so found himself in collision with current opinions. He had a fair general knowledge of English literature (by which I mean considerably more than is yet supposed necessary for an Englishman's education), with a preference for modern poetry, and especially for such as gave expression to his own ideas. I do not think he cared much for the use of language as a fine art, though he had a great appreciation of arrangement and composition. His own style, always admirably clear and often eloquent, was never elaborate; for we cannot fairly count the studied ornament of his College declamations, which were not only produced while he was an undergraduate, but for an occasion which justified some special aiming at rhetorical effect. Much of his best work was actually spoken before it was written.

He gave most of his public lectures with no visible preparation beyond very short notes, and the outline seemed to be filled in without effort or hesitation. Afterwards he would revise the lecture from a shorthand-writer's report, or sometimes write down from memory almost exactly what he had said. It fell out now and then, however, that neither of these things was done; and in such cases there is now no record of the lecture at all. Once or twice he tried writing part of the lecture beforehand, but found it only an embarrassment in the delivery. I believe the only one wholly put in writing in the first instance was *Ethics of Religion*, which he was unable to deliver himself. I cannot find anything showing early aptitude for acquiring languages; but that he had it and was fond of exercising it in later life is certain. One practical reason for it was the desire of being able to read mathematical papers in foreign journals; but this would not account for his taking up Spanish, of which he acquired a competent knowledge in the course of a tour to the Pyrenees. When he was at Algiers in 1876 he began Arabic, and made progress enough to follow in a general way a course of lessons given in that language. He read modern Greek fluently, and at one time he was curious about Sanskrit. He even spent some time on hieroglyphics. A new language is a riddle before it is conquered, a power in the hand afterwards: to Clifford every riddle was a challenge, and every chance of new power a divine opportunity to be seized. Hence he was likewise interested in the various modes of conveying and expressing language invented for special purposes, such as the Morse alphabet and shorthand. One of his ideas about education was that children might learn these things at an early age, perhaps in play, so as to grow up no less familiar with them than with common printing and writing. I have forgotten to mention his command of French and German, the former of which he knew very well, and the latter quite sufficiently; I think his German reading was mostly in the direction of philosophy and mathematics.

In 1863 Clifford came up with a minor scholarship to Trinity College, Cambridge; in his third year (to continue for the present on the line of his literary accomplishments) he won the declamation prize with a very brilliant discourse on Sir W. Raleigh, partly cast in the form of quasi-dramatic dialogues, and accordingly had to deliver the annual oration at the Commemoration of Benefactors in December. His subject was a panegyric of the late Master of the College, Dr. Whewell, whose death was then recent. It was treated in an original and unexpected manner, Dr. Whewell's claim to admiration and emulation being put on the ground of his intellectual life exemplifying in an eminent degree the active and creating



faculty. "Thought is powerless except it make something outside of itself: the thought which conquers the world is not contemplative but active. And it is this that I am asking you to worship to-day." Taking this oration as a whole, it must be considered as a *tour de force*, giving glimpses and undetermined promises of speculative power. But there occurred in it an apologue which caught the attention of some good judges at the time, and so well illustrates the fanciful and sportive side of Clifford's mind that I shall here transcribe it.

"Once upon a time—much longer than six thousand years ago—the Trilobites were the only people that had eyes; and they were only just beginning to have them, and some even of the Trilobites had as yet no signs of coming sight. So that the utmost they could know was that they were living in darkness, and that perhaps there was such a thing as light. But at last one of them got so far advanced that when he happened to come to the top of the water in the daytime he saw the sun. So he went down and told the others that in general the world was light, but there was one great light which caused it all. Then they killed him for disturbing the commonwealth; but they considered it impious to doubt that in general the world was light, and that there was one great light which caused it all. And they had great disputes about the manner in which they had come to know this. Afterwards another of them got so far advanced that when he happened to come to the top of the water in the night-time he saw the stars. So he went down and told the others that in general the world was dark, but that nevertheless there was a great number of little lights in it. Then they killed him for maintaining false doctrines: but from that time there was a division amongst them, and all the Trilobites were split into two parties, some maintaining one thing and some the other, until such time as so many of them had learned to see that there could be no doubt about the matter."

The interpretation was barely indicated on this occasion; but it is worked out in another Cambridge MS. which must have been written shortly afterwards, and in which the apologue stands first as a kind of text. It was nothing less than a theory of the intellectual growth of mankind; and the position was that, as the physical senses have been gradually developed out of confused and uncertain impressions, so a set of intellectual senses or *insights* are still in course of development, the operation of which may ultimately be expected to be as certain and immediate as our ordinary sense-perceptions.

This theory may be traced in the discourse *On some of the Conditions of Mental Development*, delivered in March, 1868, which stands first in the present collection; and for that reason I make special mention of it. Otherwise it was only one inventive experi-

ment among many. I should far exceed my limits if I were to attempt any account of the various forms of speculation, physical, metaphysical, and ethical, through which Clifford ranged in the first few years after his degree. Not that he was constantly changing his opinions, as a superficial observer might have thought; he was seeking for definite principles, and of set purpose made his search various and widespread. He had a singular power of taking up any theory that seemed to him at all worth investigating, realising it, working it out, and making it completely his own for the time being, and yet all the while consciously holding it as an experiment, and being perfectly ready to give it up when found wanting.

Clifford's mathematical course at Cambridge was a struggle between the exigencies of the Tripos and his native bent for independent reading and research going far beyond the subjects of the examination; and the Tripos had very much the worst of it. If there was any faculty in which he was entirely wanting, it was the examination-faculty. On this subject I am not competent to speak with certainty, but it is my belief that, from the point of view to which the class-list is an end in itself, Clifford omitted most of the things he ought to have read, and read everything he ought not to have read. Nevertheless his powers of original work carried him so far that he came out Second Wrangler in the Tripos of 1867, and was also Second Smith's Prizeman. I am fortunately able to quote on this head the statement of one of our first living analysts, Professor Sylvester:—

"Like the late Dr. Whewell, Professor Clerk Maxwell, and Sir William Thomson, Mr. Clifford was Second Wrangler at the University of Cambridge. I believe there is little doubt that he might easily have been first of his year had he chosen to devote himself exclusively to the University curriculum instead of pursuing his studies, while still an undergraduate, in a more extended field, and with a view rather to self-culture than to the acquisition of immediate honour or emolument."

This pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, and without even such regard to collateral interests as most people would think a matter of common prudence, was the leading character of Clifford's work throughout his life. The discovery of truth was for him an end in itself, and the proclamation of it, or of whatever seemed to lead to it, a duty of primary and paramount obligation. This had something to do with the fascination of his teaching; he never seemed to be imposing dogmas on his hearers, but to be leading them into the enjoyment of a common possession. He did not tell them that knowledge was priceless and truth beautiful; he made them feel it. He gave them not formulas, but ideas. Again I can appeal to a witness of undoubted authority. The following words were written in 1871 by a man in no way given to unmeasured expression of his mind; and as eminent in mathematical physics as

the author of the statement I have already cited is in pure mathematics, I mean Professor Clerk Maxwell:—

“The peculiarity of Mr. Clifford’s researches, which in my opinion points him out as the right man for a chair of mathematical science, is that they tend not to the elaboration of abstruse theorems by ingenious calculations, but to the elucidation of scientific ideas by the concentration upon them of clear and steady thought. The pupils of such a teacher not only obtain clearer views of the subjects taught, but are encouraged to cultivate in themselves that power of thought which is so liable to be neglected amidst the appliances of education.”

I shall not attempt to enter in more detail on the amount and character of Clifford’s subsequent contributions to mathematical science, having reason to hope that this task will shortly be undertaken by competent hands and in a more appropriate connection. But in an introduction to his philosophical writings it is fitting to call attention to the manner in which he brought mathematical conceptions to bear upon philosophy. He took much pleasure in the speculative constructions of imaginary or non-Euclidean systems of space-relations which have been achieved by Continental geometers, partly because they afforded a congenial field for the combined exercise of scientific intuition and unbridled fancy. He liked talking about imaginary geometry, as a matter of pure amusement, to any one interested in it. But at the same time he attached a serious import to it. He was the first in this country, as Helmholtz in Germany, to call attention to the philosophical importance of these new ideas with regard to the question of the nature and origin of geometrical knowledge. His opinion on this point is briefly expressed in the lectures *On the Philosophy of the Pure Sciences*. He intended to recast and expand these, and doubtless would have amplified this particular discussion. It will be seen that he considered Kant’s position in the matter of “transcendental æsthetic” to be wholly unassailable if it was once admitted that geometrical knowledge is really exact and universal. The ordinary arguments for the derivative nature of axioms appeared to him ingenious but hopeless attempts to escape from this fatal admission. And it may be said in general terms that he had a much fuller appreciation of the merit and the necessity of Kant’s work than most adherents of the English school of psychology. Of course I do not include Professor Huxley, whose testimony to Kant in his little book on Hume is as unmistakable as it is weighty.

Few words will suffice to set down the remaining facts of Clifford’s life, or what we are accustomed to call facts because they can be dated and made equally known to everybody, as if that made them somehow more real than the passages and events which in truth decide the issues of life and fix the courses of a man’s work. In 1868 he was elected a Fellow of Trinity College, and after spending

rather more than two years at Cambridge, he was in 1871 appointed to the Professorship of Applied Mathematics at University College, London. Meanwhile he had taken part in the English Eclipse expedition of 1870: his letters of that time show keen enjoyment of the new experience of men and cities, and of the natural beauty of the Mediterranean coasts, which he was to visit again, as fate would have it, only on the sad and fruitless errand of attempting to recover strength when it was too late. In June, 1874, he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society; he might have been proposed at a much earlier time, but had then declined, turning it off with the remark that he did not want to be respectable yet. And such was the absence in him of anything like vanity or self-assertion, that when his scruples were overcome, and his election took place, he was the last person from whom his friends heard of it. I did not know it myself till several months later. On the 7th of April, 1875, he married Lucy, daughter of Mr. John Lane, and granddaughter of Brandford Lane, of Barbados. This was the occasion of the only voluntary leave of absence he ever took from his lectures at University College, when he characteristically informed his class that he was obliged to be absent on important business, which would probably not occur again. Clifford's house was thenceforward (as, indeed, his rooms, both at Cambridge and in London, had already been) the meeting-point of a numerous body of friends, in which almost every possible variety of taste and opinion was represented, and many of whom had nothing else in common. The scientific element had naturally a certain predominance; and with Clifford, as with other men, a close friendship implied, as a rule, some sort of general coincidence in sentiments and aims, personal and intellectual concord being apt to go together. But he cared for sympathy, not for agreement; coincidence in actual results was indifferent to him. He wrote of a very near and dear friend (G. Crotch, of St. John's College, Cambridge), whose death preceded his own by some years: "We never agreed upon results, but we always used the same method with the same object." Much more would it be an utter mistake to suppose that Clifford was a scientific fanatic who reserved his social qualities for people who happened to accept his theories, or that he could not be at his ease and make the charm of his presence felt among persons who did not care for theories at all. It was possible to take offence at certain passages in his writings, but impossible not to like the man; and some of those to whom Clifford's published opinions were naturally most repugnant, but who had the opportunity of personal intercourse with him, were by no means the last to express their sympathy and anxiety when the threatenings of the disease which carried him off became apparent. This charm remained with him to his very last days;

even when he was in an enfeebled and almost prostrate condition there were those who conceived for him and his, upon sudden and casual acquaintance, an affection and good-will which bore such fruit of kindly deeds as men usually look for only from the devotion ripened by long familiarity. Something of this was due to the extreme openness and candour of his conversation; something to the quickness with which he read the feelings of others, and the delicacy and gentleness with which he adapted himself to them; something, perhaps most, to a certain undefinable simplicity in which the whole man seemed to be revealed, and the whole moral beauty of his character to be grounded. It was by this simplicity, one may suppose, that he was endeared from his early days to children. He always took delight in being with them, and appeared to have a special gift of holding their attention. That he did not live to teach his own children is deeply to be regretted not only for their sake, but for the interest of education as a science and an art. What he could do for the amusement of children (and of all persons healthy enough not to be ashamed of childishness) was shown to the world in his contributions to a collection of fairy tales called *The Little People*. One of these ("The Giant's Shoes") is one of the choicest pieces of pure nonsense ever put together; and he doubtless enjoyed writing it as much as any child could enjoy hearing it. He seemed to have an inexhaustible store of merriment at all times: not merely a keen perception of the ludicrous, but an ever fresh gaiety and gladness in the common pleasures of life. His laughter was free and clear like a child's, and as little restrained by any consideration of conventional gravity. It was hardly possible to be depressed in his company: and this was so not only in his best days, but as long as he had strength to sustain conversation at all. The charm of his countenance and talk banished for the time the anxiety we felt for him (only too justly) whenever we were not with him.

On the intellectual side this character of simplicity manifested itself in the absolute straightforwardness of everything he said and did; and this, being joined to subtlety and a wide range of vision, became in speculation and discussion a very formidable power. If there was anything for which he had no toleration, and with which he would enter into no compromise, it was insincerity in thought, word, or deed. He expressed his own opinions plainly and strongly because he held it the duty of every man so to do; he could not discuss great subjects in a half-hearted fashion under a system of mutual conventions. As for considerations of policy or expediency that seemed to interfere in any way with the down-right speaking of truth for the truth's sake, he was simply incapable of entertaining them. Being always frank, he was at

times indiscreet; but consummate discretion has never yet been recognised as a necessary or even a very appropriate element of moral heroism. This must be borne in mind in estimating such passages of his writings as, judged by the ordinary rules of literary etiquette, may seem harsh and violent.

Personal enmity was a thing impossible to Clifford. Once he wrote: "I believe if all the murderers and all the priests and all the liars in the world were united into one man, and he came suddenly upon me round a corner and said '*How do you do?*' in a smiling way, I could not be rude to him upon the instant." And it was the bare truth. Neither did he ever make an enemy that I know of; I do not count one or two blundering attacks which, however far they might go beyond the fair bounds of controversy or satire, were made by people who only guessed at the man from a superficial inspection of his writings, and were incapable of understanding either. Yet he carried about with him as deadly a foe as could have been wished him by any of those who fear and hate the light he strove so manfully to spread abroad. This was the perilous excess in his own frame of nervous energy over constitutional strength and endurance. He was able to call upon himself, with a facility which in the result was fatal, for the expenditure of power in ways and to an extent which only a very strong constitution could have permanently supported; and here the constitution was feeble. He tried experiments on himself when he ought to have been taking precautions. He thought, I believe, that he was really training his body to versatility and disregard of circumstances, and fancied himself to be making investments when he was in fact living on his capital. At Cambridge he would constantly sit up most of the night working or talking. In London it was not very different, and once or twice he wrote the whole night through; and this without any proportionate reduction of his occupations in more usual hours. The paper on "The Unseen Universe" was composed in this way, except a page or two at the beginning, at a single sitting which lasted from a quarter to ten in the evening till nine o'clock the following morning. So, too, was the article on Virchow's address. But Clifford's rashness extended much farther than this one particular. He could not be induced, or only with the utmost difficulty, to pay even moderate attention to the cautions and observances which are commonly and aptly described as taking care of one's self. Had he been asked if it was wrong to neglect the conditions of health in one's own person, as well as to approve or tolerate their neglect on a larger scale, he would certainly have answered yes. But to be careful about himself was a thing that never occurred to him. Even when, in the spring of 1876, distinct and grave indications of pulmonary disease were noted, his advisers

and friends could hardly persuade him that there was anything more serious than could be set right by two or three weeks' rest in the country. Here, however, there came into play something more than incredulity or indifference; the spirit of the worker and inventor rebelled against thus being baffled. His repugnance was like that of a wounded soldier who thinks himself dishonoured if he quits the field while his limbs can bear him. Reluctantly and almost indignantly he accepted six months' leave of absence, and spent the summer of that year in a journey to Algiers and the south of Spain. He came back recruited for the time, and was allowed to winter in England on pledges of special care and avoidance of exposure. These were in the main observed, and so matters went on for a year and a half more, as it seemed with fair prospects of ultimate recovery and tolerably secure enjoyment of life. What mischief was already done could not be undone; but the spread of it seemed in a way to be permanently arrested. But in the early months of last year there came a sudden change for the worse. His father's death, which happened at this time, was a grievous blow, and the conjunction of this with exciting literary work done under pressure of time threw upon him a strain which he was wholly unable to resist. The essay on Virchow's address, which will close the collection, is both in my opinion and in that of other and more competent judges one of Clifford's best and most mature performances. But it was produced at a fearful cost, we have already seen in what manner. A few days after the MS. had left his hands he received a peremptory warning that he was in a state of such imminent danger that he must give up all work and leave England forthwith. This time the warning was too stern to admit of doubt or even delay. Yet, while the necessary preparations were in hand, he would not leave his official duties until he actually broke down in the attempt to complete a lecture. He was now suffering, not from any inroad of specific local disease, but from a rapid and alarming collapse of general strength which made it seem doubtful if he could live many weeks. But his constitutional frailty was accompanied withal by a wonderful power of rallying from prostration; and one could not help entertaining a dim hope, even to the last, that this vitality was somehow the deepest thing in his nature, and would at last win the day. In April, 1878, Clifford and his wife left England for the Mediterranean; the accounts they sent home were various and often anxious; but after voyages and short halts which embraced Gibraltar, Venice, and Malta, they rested for some weeks at Monte Gencroso, and there for the first time there was the appearance of steady improvement setting in. From this place Clifford wrote long letters with his own hand, full of his usual spirit and manifold interest in everything about him. I may mention here

that his letters were the more valuable because they were always spontaneous and could very seldom be counted on beforehand. He wrote quickly and easily; and yet for some obscure reason letter-writing, especially as a matter of business, was beyond measure irksome and difficult to him. He would rather take almost any trouble than answer a letter, and the painfulness of answering was at its height when (as pretty often happened) old acquaintances applied to him for testimonials. For in these cases it was aggravated by utter impossibility of lending himself to the petty exaggerations and dissimulations which custom allows to pass current for such purposes, and which are almost thought to be required by civility. One such application, from a man he had known before but had lost sight of, vexed him extremely; he did not know what to do with it, for he could honestly have certified only as to the past, and he carried the letter about with him till it was ragged, being newly vexed every time he saw it. There were many letters of friends which he regretted to the last not having answered. Several received in the last months or weeks of his life he intended to answer if he had ever become strong enough. Yet now and then he would write unsought to some one he was intimate with, and throw himself completely into his letter; and then his descriptions were so full of life and colour that they might well be taken as models by any one minded to study the art of correspondence, not uncommonly alleged to be lost since the introduction of cheap and rapid communications. Such letters he sent to England from Spain and Sicily in 1870, and from Algiers in 1876.

In August, 1878, there being signs of improvement, and a warm climate not being judged necessary or very desirable at that season, leave was given for a short return to England. Clifford came home looking very ill and feeble to ordinary observation, but much better to those who had seen him before he started. He was incapable of continuous exertion of any kind, but much of the old animation had come back, and his conversation had lost nothing of its vigour and brilliancy. The object of the summer journey had been rest and freedom from care above all things: now it was planned that with the first days of autumn he should again go in search of conditions which might be not only rest-giving but curative. But all plans were cut short by a relapse which took place late in September, induced by fatigue. From that day the fight was a losing one, though fought with such tenacity of life that sometimes the inevitable end seemed as if it might yet be put far off. Clifford's patience, cheerfulness, unselfishness, and continued interest in his friends and in what was going on in the world, were unbroken and unabated through all that heavy time. Far be it from me, as it was far



from him, to grudge to any man or woman the hope or comfort that may be found in sincere expectation of a better life to come. But let this be set down and remembered, plainly and openly, for the instruction and rebuke of those who fancy that their dogmas have a monopoly of happiness, and will not face the fact that there are true men—ay, and women—to whom the dignity of manhood and the fellowship of this life, undazzled by the magic of any revelation, unholpen of any promises holding out aught as higher or more enduring than the fruition of human love and the fulfilment of human duties, are sufficient to bear the weight of both life and death. Here was a man who utterly dismissed from his thoughts, as being unprofitable or worse, all speculations on a future or unseen world; a man to whom life was holy and precious, a thing not to be despised, but to be used with joyfulness; a soul full of life and light, ever longing for activity, ever counting what was achieved as not worthy to be reckoned in comparison of what was left to do. And this is the witness of his ending, that as never man loved life more, so never man feared death less. He fulfilled well and truly that great saying of Spinoza, often in his mind and on his lips: *Homo liber de nulla re minus quam de morte cogitat.*

One last stand was made, too late to be permanently successful (if ever it could have so far availed), but yet not wholly in vain. At the opening of the present year Clifford's remnant of strength was visibly diminishing. The peril of attempting a journey was great, but no peril could be greater than that which he already lay in. Medicine had no new thing to recommend, and almost nothing to forbid: a last experiment could only be tried. Clifford sailed for Madeira, his friends hardly expecting him to live out the voyage. Of the friendship and devotion that accompanied and tended him there it is not fitting that I should speak. So it was, however, that he arrived safely in the island, and some weeks were added to his life. The change from the bitterest of recent English winters to the fair and temperate air of Madeira had no power to restore the waning forces; but it enabled him to spend his last days in ease and comparative enjoyment. He could once more look on the glories of a bountiful world, and breathe under a free sky. Something of spirit and even of strength revived; his powers of conversation, which had been restrained by mere physical weakness in his last days in England, returned to some extent, and in that short time, with all the disadvantages of a stranger and an invalid, he made new friends: one such (though in spirit not a stranger before) of whose friendship even he might have been proud. There was a glimmer of hope, faint, uncertain, but perceptible; there was a possibility that if amendment once began, it might go farther than we had dared to

speculate upon. But it was not to be. In the last days of February we learnt that his condition was hopeless; on the 3rd of March the end came. For a week he had known that it might come at any moment, and he looked to it calmly and steadfastly. So calmly had he received the warning which conveyed this knowledge that it seemed at the instant as if he did not understand it. He gave careful and exact directions as to the disposal of his works, which are partly carried out in these volumes, and, it is hoped, will be substantially fulfilled as to his mathematical remains also. His work was, indeed, the only thing personal to himself that he took much thought for; and that not because it was his own possession, but because he felt that it was his own to do and to make a possession for others. He loved it for the work's and the truth's sake, not for his own. More than this, his interest in the outer world did not desert him to the very last. He still followed the course of events, and asked for public news on the morning of his death: so strongly did he hold fast his part in the common weal and in active social life.

The essays here brought together represent, with few if any exceptions, the general view of the world and human knowledge which Clifford had definitely arrived at in his later years. I do not mean that he had got a fixed set of results and meant to rest in them; he admitted no finality of that sort. But he did believe very decidedly that the difference between right and wrong method is everywhere important, and that there is only one right method for all departments of knowledge. He held that metaphysical and theological problems ought to be discussed with exactly the same freedom from preconceived conclusions and fearlessness of consequences as any other problems. And he further held that, as the frank application of the right method of search to the physical sciences has put them on a footing of steady progress, though they differ in the amount and certainty of the knowledge already won in their respective fields, so the like effects might be expected when philosophical speculation was taken in hand by the light of science and with scientific impartiality and earnestness. For the popular or unscientific rhetoric which frequently assumes the name of philosophy Clifford had as much contempt as he permitted himself to feel for anything. Once he said of an acquaintance who was believed to be undertaking something in this kind: "He is writing a book on metaphysics, and is really cut out for it; the clearness with which he thinks he understands things and his total inability to express what little he knows will make his fortune as a philosopher." But he never accepted, and I do not think he was ever tempted to accept, the doctrine that all metaphysical inquiries ought to be put aside as unprofitable. Indeed he went beyond most English psychologists, though in a general way he

must be classed with the English school, in his estimate of the possibility of constructing a definite metaphysical system on scientific principles. With regard to the application of his philosophical ideas to theological conceptions, it may perhaps be said that he aimed at doing for dogmatic and natural theology something like what the Tübingen school in Germany have done for historical theology, namely bringing them to the light of unbiassed common sense, including therein as an important element the healthy moral sense of civilized men. Whether Clifford had any feeling that his line of work was complementary to the historical criticism of dogmas I cannot say: but so it was that he paid no special attention to the historical side of these questions, either because it did not particularly interest him, or because he thought it outside his competence. In ethics, on the other hand, he attached the utmost importance to the historical facts of moral culture as affording the key of the speculative position and indicating the profitable directions of inquiry. And it may be noted as an instance of the freshness and openness of his mind that the importance of this point of view, set forth in *The Scientific Basis of Morals* and the papers following it, was perceived by him only after he left Cambridge. The main points of the last-named essay were stated by Clifford himself in a letter written when he had nearly finished it. He described it as "showing that moral maxims are ultimately of the same nature as the maxims of any other craft: if you want to live together successfully, you must do so and so. . . . That conscience is developed out of experience by healthy natural processes. . . . That responsibility is founded on such order as we can observe, and not upon such disorder as we can conjecture." This is quite a different line from that which his speculations on the nature of duty were wont to take at Cambridge, both in the conversations I remember, and in various MS. fragments of that period which are now before me.

It will not be amiss to go back to the time when we left Clifford celebrating the late Master of Trinity in parables, and to take up more continuously than we have yet done the growth of his philosophic ideas. Before he took his degree, and I think for some little time after, he was (as before mentioned) a High Churchman; but there was an intellectual and speculative activity about his belief which made it impossible that it should remain permanently at that stage. On the one hand he acquired a far more accurate knowledge of Catholic theology than is often met with in England even among those who discuss theological questions: he was pretty well read in S. Thomas Aquinas, and would maintain the Catholic position on most points with extreme ingenuity, not unfrequently adding scientific arguments and analogies of his own. On the other hand,

believing from the first in the unity or at least the harmony of all truth, he never slackened in the pursuit of scientific knowledge and ideas. For a while he experimented in schemes for the juxtaposition of science and dogmas. Religious beliefs he regarded as outside the region of scientific proof, even when they can be made highly probable by reasoning; for, as he observes in a MS. fragment of this time, they are received and held not as probable but as certain. And he actually defined superstition as "a belief held on religious or theological grounds, but capable of scientific proof or disproof." He also held that there was a special theological faculty or insight, analogous to the scientific, poetic, and artistic faculty; and that the persons in whom this genius is exceptionally developed are the founders of new religions and religious orders. He seems to have been always and equally dissatisfied with attempts at proving theological propositions, especially in the usual manner of Protestant divinity, and with the theological version of natural history commonly called Natural Theology. When or how Clifford first came to a clear perception that this position of quasi-scientific Catholicism was untenable I do not exactly know; but I know that the discovery cost him an intellectual and moral struggle, of which traces may be found here and there in his essays. It is not the case, however, that there was any violent reaction or rushing to an opposite extreme. Some time elapsed before his philosophical opinions assumed their final consistency; and in truth what took place was not a reaction, but the fuller development of principles which had been part of his thoughts ever since he began to think for himself.

Meanwhile he was eagerly assimilating the ideas which had been established as an assured possession of science by Mr. Darwin, and were being applied to the systematic grouping and gathering together of human knowledge by Mr. Herbert Spencer. Clifford was not content with merely giving his assent to Mr. Darwin's theory: he seized on it as a living spring of action, a principle to be worked out, practised upon, used to win victories over nature, and put new vigour into speculation. For two or three years the knot of Cambridge friends of whom Clifford was the leading spirit was carried away by a wave of Darwinian enthusiasm: we seemed to ride triumphant on an ocean of new life and boundless possibilities. Natural Selection was to be the master-key of the universe; we expected it to solve all riddles and reconcile all contradictions. Among other things it was to give us a new system of ethics, combining the exactness of the utilitarian with the poetical ideals of the transcendentalist. We were not only to believe joyfully in the survival of the fittest, but to take an active and conscious part in making ourselves fitter. At one time Clifford held that it was worth our while to practise variation

deliberately; not only to avoid being the slaves of custom, but to eschew fixed habits of every kind, and to try the greatest possible number of experiments in living to increase the chances of a really valuable one occurring and being selected for preservation. So much of this theory as he ever gave to the world will be found in the discourse *On Some Conditions of Mental Development*; and I do not know that he would ever have deliberately committed himself to anything more than is there propounded. One practical deduction was that education ought to be directed not to mere instruction, but to making people think and act for themselves; and this Clifford held to be of special importance in the case of women, where the cultivation of independent power is too commonly neglected or even purposely discouraged.

The duty of independence and spontaneous activity thus conceived under Mr. Darwin's influence was reinforced from another side by the reading of Mazzini; and the result was a conception of freedom as the one aim and ideal of man. This freedom was a sort of transfigured blending of all powers of activity and progress; it included republicanism as opposed to the compulsory aspect of government and traditional authority in general, but was otherwise not bound to any particular theory in politics. Indeed it forbade binding oneself irrevocably to any theory whatever; and the one commandment of freedom was thus expressed, *Thou shalt live and not formalize*. That alone was right which was done of one's own inner conviction and mere motion; that was lifeless and evil which was done out of obedience to any external authority. "There is one thing in the world," Clifford wrote about this time, "more wicked than the desire to command, and that is the will to obey." Now this doctrine of individual and independent morality may look on the face of it very wicked and anarchical, and therefore it may be worth while to observe that the Catholic doctrine of the duty of following conscience is essentially at one with it. The conscience may or may not be rightly informed. It may be wrongly informed without one's own fault, as in the case of invincible ignorance, or with it, as in the case of culpable ignorance or perversity. But even in this last case we are told that the sin of doing an absolutely wrong thing in obedience to the voice of conscience, however misguided, is infinitely less than the sin of doing the absolutely right thing against one's conscience. The conscience must be rightly informed before a completely right action is possible.<sup>1</sup> Again, Fichte treats the sense of will and duty

(1) See the authorities collected in Dr. Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, pp. 66, 68:—"Secundum sententiam, et certam, asserentum esse peccatum discordare a conscientia erronea, invincibili aut vincibili, tenet D. Thomas, quem sequuntur omnes Scholastici." "In no manner is it lawful to act against conscience, even though a law or a superior commands it."

(from which he deduces not only morality but the existence of other men and of the world, in fact all knowledge and reality whatever) as absolutely personal and individual. Clifford's early doctrine of freedom was ardent and immature; but whoever should call it immoral would find himself committed to applying the same language to some of the greatest moralists of the world. The social theory of morality stated and partly worked out in the ethical portion of Clifford's essays is quite independent of this earlier phase. At the same time it is not necessarily inconsistent with it; for the determination of social morality is apart from the assignment of motives for individual morality, and leaves quite untouched the cultivation of individual perfection. Clifford, however, does in his later writings freely and distinctly recognize the validity of the social, or as he sometimes calls it, the tribal judgment, on the moral character of individual acts regarded as an external quality, and there was a time when he would probably have hesitated to allow this.

As to Clifford's ideas on metaphysics proper I have not much to say beyond what is disclosed in the essays themselves. His interest in philosophy grew up rapidly after he took his degree, as is generally the case with men who have any bent that way. I remember many long talks with him on metaphysical questions, but not much of the substance of them. One evening in the Long Vacation of 1868, when we were up for the Fellowship examination, we discussed the Absolute for some couple of hours, and at last defined it to our own exceeding content as that which is in necessary relation to itself. Probably we laughed at our definition the next morning, or soon after; but I am still of opinion that, as definitions of the Absolute go, this will do quite as well as any other. Clifford's philosophical reading was rather select than very wide. He had a high admiration for Berkeley, next only to Hume, and he took much pleasure in the *Ethics* of Spinoza. The interpretation of Spinoza's philosophy which I have put forward in this Review and elsewhere was common to Clifford and myself, and on that subject (as, indeed, on everything we discussed together) I owe very much to him. He was to have lectured on Spinoza at the London Institution in 1877, but his health would not allow it. There is little doubt that this would have been one of his most brilliant and original discourses. Students of Spinoza will easily trace the connection between his theory of mind and matter and the doctrine set forth in Clifford's essays on *Body and Mind*, and *The Nature of Things-in-themselves*. This was arrived at, to the best of my recollection, in 1871 or 1872; certainly before 1874, in which year the last-mentioned paper was read at a meeting of the Metaphysical Society. Briefly put, the conception is that mind is the

one ultimate reality ; not mind as we know it in the complex forms of conscious feeling and thought, but the simpler elements out of which thought and feeling are built up. The hypothetical ultimate element of mind, or atom of *mind-stuff*, precisely corresponds to the hypothetical atom of matter, being the ultimate fact of which the material atom is the phenomenon. Matter and the sensible universe are the relations between particular organisms, that is, mind organized into consciousness, and the rest of the world. This leads to results which would in a loose and popular sense be called materialist. But the theory must, as a metaphysical theory, be reckoned on the idealist side. To speak technically, it is an idealist monism. Indeed it is a very subtle form of idealism, and by no means easy of apprehension at first sight. Nevertheless there are distinct signs of a convergence towards it on the part of recent inquirers who have handled philosophical problems in a scientific spirit, and particularly those who have studied psychology on the physiological side. Perhaps we shall be told that this proves the doctrine to be materialism in disguise ; but it is hardly worth while to dispute about names while more serious things remain for discussion. And the idea does require much more working out ; involving, as it does, extensive re-statement and rearrangement of metaphysical problems. It raises not only several questions, but preliminary (and really fundamental) problems as to what questions are reasonable. For instance, it may be asked why, on this hypothesis, mind should become conscious at a particular degree of complexity, or be conscious at all. I should myself say that I do not know and do not expect ever to know, and I believe Clifford would have said the same. But I can conceive some one taking up the theory and trying to make it carry further refinements and explanations. Again, a more subtle objection, but in my opinion a fallacious one, would be that it is not really a monism but a dualism, putting mind (as the undetermined *mind-stuff*) and consciousness in place of the old-fashioned matter and mind. This, however, is not the place to pursue the subject : and I do not think the outline of the hypothesis can be made clearer by any explanation of mine than Clifford has already made it.

After all, I have wished to speak of the man rather than his opinions ; but the speculative interests I shared with him, being in a manner part of himself, have claimed their due, and perhaps obtained rather more. Let us now gather up a few matters of personal habit and character which have not yet been noticed. The predominance of light as a figure and a symbol in Clifford's writing will be remarked : he associates it with the right and all things good so constantly and naturally that it is one of the marks of his style. He had physically a great love of light, and chose to write, when he

could, in a clear and spacious room, with the windows quite free of curtains. Though he was not for most ordinary purposes a business-like man, and was careless of his own attire, he was neat and exact in his literary work. He would not allow books to be misused or carelessly cut, and his own MS. was very fair, regular, and free from erasures. He was careful about punctuation, and insisted on having his own way in it, and he especially disliked superfluous commas. At the same time he was fond of handicraft, and his thoughts often ran upon mechanical invention. No enumeration of tastes and occupations, however, can adequately represent the variety and flexibility of his intellect, and still less the tender, imaginative, poetical side of his mind. Now and then he wrote verses in which this partly found expression. They were mostly of a private or occasional nature, or else too fragmentary for publication. One very graceful song is to be found in the volume of fairy tales already spoken of. But the real expression of Clifford's varied and fascinating qualities was in his whole daily life and conversation, perceived and felt at every moment in his words and looks, and for that very reason impossible to describe. Nor can portraits go very far to supply that part of it which fell to the sight; for the attractive animation and brightness of his countenance depended on very slight, subtle, and rapidly succeeding changes. The features themselves were of a massive and irregular type which may be called Socratic: in a bust they might have looked stern, in the living face they had an aspect not only of intellectual beauty but of goodwill and gentle playfulness. But I began with declaring my task impossible, and at the end I feel still more keenly that all words fall short of what I would convey. The part has fallen to me of doing to a loved and honoured friend such honour as I could: the will at least will be accepted.

Purpureos spargun flores . . . et fungar iuani  
Munero.

FREDERICK POLLOCK.



## DEMOCRACY IN VICTORIA.

### I.—REASONS WHY VICTORIA IS DEMOCRATIC.

My purpose is to examine the political problems which are just now exciting interest, or which are soon likely to be discussed, in Victoria. I start from the assumption that society in Victoria is democratic in tone, and is likely to remain so during another generation at least. There are persons who may demur to either of these propositions. Some will be inclined to say that our political society, though it works under democratic forms, is really conservative; while a still larger number will contend that we are gradually outgrowing the period in which democratic forms were natural and perhaps necessary. It is not easy to ascertain the amount of difference between these views by a mere definition of the word democratic. Louis Napoleon claimed the epithet for a despotism sanctioned by a plebiscite; and it has been currently applied to the constitutions of the old slave States in North America, under which the whole coloured population was divested of civic rights, and the mass of the white population was incapable of exercising them intelligently. It seems, therefore, proper to premise that when I speak of Democracy I mean self-government by men educated up to a common low level, and trained by the habit of self-government under institutions which secure power to the majority. I assume that such men will be disposed to look to the duties of property at least as jealously as to its rights; will sympathise with labour against capital where the two are in apparent antagonism; will wish to see property subdivided; and will be especially careful of whatever secures the independence of the poorer classes, vote by ballot, universal suffrage, and free education. Some will think, and I believe justly, that there is nothing in all this to which a Conservative may not subscribe. In fact, those like myself who claim for Democracy that it is the most sensible and flexible, as well as the only just form of government, are quite as anxious to see real rights tenderly regarded, as to provide that necessary reforms be carried in their proper time without hindrance from the mechanism of the constitution.

It would be difficult to find natives of the British Isles more nearly equal in the accidents of birth, education, or fortune, than the settlers of Victoria were at the time when the discovery of gold had made it populous. Those who had first come over from New South Wales and Tasmania were mostly, by their antecedents, between the higher and the lower classes in England, and had been levelled by life in

their new home: the poorer man having his faculties stimulated by the varied occupations of the bush, while the richer, shut out in many instances from educated society, and working like his own field-hands and among them, was only kept distinct by some traditions of manner, and by the habit of command. When the discovery of gold attracted tens of thousands from the old world, the emigrants were commonly men sufficiently below the upper classes to leave no valuable prospects behind them, and sufficiently above the lowest to be able to pay their own passages. There were, no doubt, exceptions on either side. A few hundred criminals were attracted; but these are mostly accounted for in the inordinate population of our prisons a few years back. So, again, a few hundred men whose natural place was in public offices or in the learned professions at home, drifted out to the colonies, and either tried their hands at mining, with general unsuccess, or swelled the professions and the Civil Service. Meanwhile, the circumstances of the time were levelling the small inequalities that remained. For all purposes of money-making, the miner, whose eye is trained to discover the indications of ore, and the shepherd or herdsmen, who know the points of stock, and where good country is to be found, are better trained men in a young country than the average university graduate; and the clerk or store-keeper, who was on the spot, knew the local wants, or could anticipate local fluctuations, had great advantages over the wealthy London exporter. We are still so near the recollections of this time that even now many among the poorest working-men have been the mates or familiar customers of those who rank as merchant-princes or as shepherd-kings; and these, in turn, can look back upon the day when their present position would have seemed to themselves one of inaccessible grandeur. I am not prepared to say that I think difference of birth in the old feudal sense counts for very much at present in English society; but I think a mitigated form of it—respect for inherited wealth or social position—counts sensibly; and even this mitigated form is, it will be seen, almost impossible in Victoria.

Besides this, our European immigrants, though not much affected by abstract theories, have mostly carried away with them a strong dislike to aristocratic forms of society. This feeling is, of course, deepest in the Irish, who remember evictions by absentee landlords or by their middlemen; in those Highland men who come from what are humorously termed "improved" districts in Scotland; and in the German settlers from every part of North Germany. But it is a perceptible influence even among the English immigrants who have known nothing worse at home than low wages, insufficient food, and perpetual dictation from the squire and the parson. These men are well aware that wherever we do not consciously change English

institutions in the new world, we are bound, sooner or later, to reproduce them; and that while English landlordism is mitigated in some instances by a half-patriarchal feeling towards dependants, by a sense of public duty, and by the restraints of public opinion, the conditions of a new society involve the recognition of right before the feeling of duty has been developed. The English landlord says, in substance, to his tenantry, "I am far better educated than you, and therefore you must vote as I tell you; you have grown up on my land, and therefore you are bound to show me and my friends deference and respect; you derive your whole livelihood from me, and I insist on seeing that you spend in proportion to your station, and teach your children enough and not too much." The Victorian landlord cannot start from these premisses, but he has a vague idea that the prerogatives which accompany landed property in England ought to accompany it all the world over; and he dismisses the tenant or workman who votes against him, is irritated if hats are not touched to him, and denounces all proposals for the higher culture of the masses as communism. What was harsh and repulsive, but not unnatural, in England, becomes grotesque and brutal in a new country, though the instances are incomparably rarer. The older at least among the colonists note that human nature among the rich is the same here as at home, and take the warning not to invest a class with mischievous power.

There is another more wholesome way in which our connection with England fosters the democratic sentiment. If the term "educated men" be applied to all university graduates and members of the so-called learned professions, and of the Civil Service, with officers of the army and navy, I have no doubt that a strong majority in England is Conservative; but if it be applied only to men of exceptional thinking power or acquired knowledge on political and cognate matters, it is not too much to say that four out of five are Liberals. The works of such men as J. S. Mill, Fawcett, Thorold Rogers, Cliffe Leslie, Bagehot, Freeman, Cornwall Lewis, &c., are perhaps not as well known or as judiciously estimated in Victoria as in England, but they exercise incomparably more influence, because, when an idea, right or wrong, has once filtered into the public mind through the press, it is much easier to apply it in a new country than in an old, in a country where the retarding forces are small, than in one where they are all-powerful. No doubt the instance of protection is one exception to this rule. On that subject, Liberals and Conservatives in England are united against a favourite tenet of Victorian Liberals; and the Conservative press in Melbourne repeatedly tries, in consequence, to parade its party as the representative of English Liberalism. The matter may easily be stated. In past years the Liberal party has carried the abolition of State aid to

religion, the establishment of free, secular, and compulsory education, universal suffrage, vote by ballot, and the imposition of a land-tax. It desires at present to establish the right of the Assembly to vote money supplies, to curtail the right of veto on legislation exercised by the Council, to make middle-class and university education free, or nearly so, to hinder the concentration of land in a few large properties, and to rescue the yeomanry from usurers, by the institution of Banks of Agriculture on the model of the Prussian. It is even so far *laissez faire* in its principles as to oppose the importation of immigrants at the cost of the State. On all these points, except that of primary education, which till lately united men of all parties,<sup>1</sup> it has been persistently, and often savagely, opposed by the Conservative party and the Conservative press.

In England the Established Church is a great bulwark of Conservatism in the country districts. The vicar is often nominated by the squire or connected with the country gentry, and finds what little society he gets among Conservative land-owners or their men of business. Even should his own views have a tinge of Liberalism, he will scruple to take any active part as a Liberal, not because he is timid or dishonest, but because he dares not alienate the men from whom he derives help for his poorer parishioners, and because public sentiment in England is opposed to political parsons. Where the clergyman works in harmony with the squire or is the squire, his power is almost absolute. He can compel all the children to attend school and their parents to attend church; can ruin a labourer or secure him constant employment; can shut up public-houses, forbid chapels to be erected, and direct the amusements of the villagers. I have known one case where a squire-parson succeeded during a long parochial life in preventing the people in his cure from purchasing the Bible, to which he objected as unprofitable for rustics. The secret of this tremendous power is no doubt partly moral. The clergyman is often a self-sacrificing and earnest man, who commands love and respect by his kindly sympathies and unselfish toil. But his influence is always based in great measure upon the personal interests of his flock. The labourer dares not risk a place of twelve shillings a week by offending an influential neighbour; the labourer's wife is terribly dependant on the tickets for soup and flannel and coal which the clergyman's wife controls. The one man in the village who can mediate between employer and employed, between landlord and tenant, is necessarily one with whom all wish to stand upon good terms. The situation is not a healthy one for either party, and the very clergyman who thinks it right in the presence of imperishable interests to promote church-going and

(1) Latterly, a large section of the Conservatives has declared in favour of denominational education in order to catch the Catholic vote.

Sunday-schools through an appeal to secondary motives, is apt to contract, even unconsciously, a certain cynical Conservatism of tone, and to regard the men and women under his care as children whom he must humour and coerce alternately. Some of the manliest and tenderest men I have known have been Anglican parsons, but I have never found one in the old country who had understood the infinite capabilities of self-respect and generous feeling that show themselves in the English labourer when he lives under free institutions in a new land.

Now, it need scarcely be said, that the clergy in Victoria have no patronage and no alms to dispense. The Anglican clergy, who for the most part retain Conservative opinions, rank, I am inclined to think, rather below than above the ministers of other denominations. They are not appreciably better educated; they number fewer popular preachers, for the Church of England is still essentially liturgical; and they are worse paid than their rivals, because they are even yet constrained to work the voluntary system, and their flocks have not learned to contribute as many poorer congregations do. Therefore, although the moral influence of the various Churches in Victoria is perhaps even greater than in England, inasmuch as the class that has colonized this country is essentially the church and chapel-going class, the Victorian clergy derive no part of their authority from social prestige or position. Indeed, the relations in England have been inverted, and it is the clergy who look to their hearers for kindly offices and support. To a certain extent, as I shall presently show, this tends to make the pulpit Conservative. But the broad fact that we have nothing like the English Establishment, with its manifold influences over the daily lives of the whole population, remains, none the less, a powerful reason why democratic institutions have grown up naturally on this side of the world.

Let us now take this population, which started on a level, or was levelled by circumstances, which came out disliking aristocracy, which invigorates itself with the thoughts of advanced English Liberals, and is free from the material influences of a Church Establishment, and we shall find, if we examine the history of the last twenty-five years, that it has enjoyed an exceptional prosperity. I think it is not an overstatement to say that the wages of unskilled labourers during that period have averaged nearly three times as much here as in England, taking money-payments alone; that life here is cheaper than in the old country; and that the labour of children is proportionately more profitable than even that of adults. This improvement in position has been on the whole well used. There is less drunkenness than in England; the women dress better and never work in the fields, except on emergencies; education is

more valued than at home; and money is often laid by as a provision for bad times. Side by side with this improvement in wages have come opportunities for investment, such as rarely present themselves to the working man at home. Such a man, where he has something to lay by, must commonly join a friendly society or deposit his earnings in the savings bank at a very low rate of interest. In Victoria throughout the mining districts the miners invest freely in shares; the agricultural settler can purchase land below its market value if he will only live on it and farm it; and the townsman speculates in suburban lots or joins a building society. There is more money to invest among even the poorest classes, and profitable investments are more accessible to the man of small means. Again, farming in Victoria is of a rougher and more primitive kind than in England, requires infinitely less capital, and is supplemented by many temporary expedients, such as shearing on the sheep stations, cutting fuel for towns, and carting in parts where there are no railroads. Can it be wondered at if the mass of the population has grown up under these circumstances independent and self-reliant?

The Constitution Act of 1855 required a property qualification from electors to the Legislative Assembly, and imposed one for representatives. Both these restrictions have been repealed; and as the voter might qualify by renting a house of 10*l.* a year, it cannot be said that in this instance the necessary exclusion of any large class formed a substantive grievance in fact. The promoters of the restriction argued that it only disfranchised those who were incorrigibly thriftless, or those who, as birds of passage, had no interest and therefore no stake in the country. Their opponents took their stand on the broader principle that the limitation was artificial, that every man who paid taxes or was affected by legislation had a right to be consulted about law-making, and that if the class disfranchised was large it ought not to be disregarded, if small it might safely be admitted. The ballot has supplemented manhood suffrage by securing the voter from intimidation. It is not now as popular with Conservatives as it was in days when they believed that it sheltered the timid Conservative voter; and employers generally are aware that their power would be greater with a system of open voting. But the system is so manifestly equitable that its enemies can only impugn it by contending that it gives facilities to stuffing the votes and to personation. Of course any system can be abused. I can remember when a Doctor of Divinity voted three times in the day at an Oxford election. But without saying that Victorian elections are absolutely free from reproach, I may say that I believe they are nearly so, and that the only abuse which an ordinary scrutiny would not detect is when men who have quitted a district, but whose names are improperly retained on the rolls, appear and vote as if they were still resident.

At a late contest, which was a test for the two great parties in a critical moment, the Liberal candidate was said to have owed his success very much to this class of voters. Two months later, when he accepted office and the contest was renewed, the Conservatives multiplied precautions to exclude unqualified voters, with the result that the whole number voting was a little smaller than before, and the Liberal majority a little larger.

Another change in the Constitution Act has reduced the longest term during which an Assembly can sit from five to three years. The result is not only to make the member more directly accountable to his constituency, but to dispose him to attend carefully to the wants of the locality and of individual constituents. Whether this be good or bad will be considered elsewhere. What I desire here is to point out that it increases the elector's power of interference with Government and his wish to secure influence. When I was first charged with a commission to inquire into the state of public education in Victoria, I learned to my astonishment that all appointments in the service were believed to be due to parliamentary influence; and although the belief is unquestionably exaggerated, it has only too much foundation when all allowances have been made. In other departments the abuse is even more notorious. A man gets employment, be it only to break stones on the road, through the influence of his member, and applies to Parliament for a committee if he is discharged for idleness or incompetency. So long as the country presents its present features of a small population and a large expenditure on public works, so long as the State supports about ten thousand *employés*, we must probably expect that this system will endure, unless it be found possible to devise some method of selection and promotion by merit only.

This State service after all can only employ a portion of the population, and offers in most cases less brilliant chances than are offered by private enterprise. Accordingly the mass of thoughtful men are more desirous to provide for the general well-being of the community than to establish political interest. One natural and legitimate object is to keep employment constant and wages high. The workman believes that a State bounty to native industries has the effect of attracting capital into manufactures, which pay high wages, which employ women and children, and which offer employment when the mining or agricultural interests may be temporarily depressed. He is well aware that protective duties are a tax on consumers for the benefit of producers, but considers the loss to individuals more than compensated by the gain to the State at large. On all these points he finds himself opposed to the large land-owner, the merchant, and the banker, who are almost always free-traders by early training or conviction, and who bear the chief burden of a protective tariff. Gradu-

ally another point of difference between the wealthier and the poorer sections of society has risen into prominence. In a prosperous and multiplying community land is always a good investment; and the circumstances of the colony of Victoria have made it especially good. Much of the best land is near the seaboard. Land generally is so plentiful, that its price even at auctions in early days was almost nominal; and there has been so much capital deposited in the banks and seeking investment, that men of character and business talent have always found it easy to borrow on landed security. Accordingly the best land in the colony has been freely bought up, till large tracts have been turned into pastoral solitudes; and the small farmer wanting a freehold farm is now very commonly obliged to settle in the back districts on second-class land, at a distance from a market. No doubt in theory it would pay the large land-owners near Melbourne to break up their estates and sell them or lease them in small parcels; but land-owners here, as in England, prefer keeping land to parting with it; and have special reasons here for disliking to be troubled with tenants, while the yeoman will commonly not rent good land if he can buy a freehold elsewhere. Consequently a cry is raised for restraining the formation of large properties by law; and some advocate that the State should impose a progressive land-tax, and others that it should renounce selling land, and should only lease for the future. Either of these measures would destroy the large profits which are now made upon land-jobbing by the jobbers themselves, and by all who advance money to them. Here again, therefore, the capitalist and the community are at feud; and this feud is just now even more bitter than the division between protectionists and free-traders, as trade has had time to adjust itself to a protective tariff, and no colony except Victoria is avowedly protectionist; but the land-law reformers are striking at a system which is one of large present profit, and which is threatened by their opinions in every part of Australia. The question is in fact one of vital import to a Democracy; for as political power is inseparable from landed property, a community that allows its land to pass into the hands of a few hundred persons has undoubtedly let itself be shorn of its strength. Every man who once lived in the British Isles understands this. Meanwhile, it can hardly be doubted that the many who look forward to working under the State, or to rising in the State service, are likely to set a high value on the institutions that seem to give every man a chance in the lottery.

Probably I have said enough to show why democratic institutions have sprung up naturally in Victoria, and are maintained by habit, by sentiment, and by self-interest. It remains to show that these facts are almost balanced by opposite influences, that tend strongly in a Conservative direction.



## II.—CAUSES TENDING TO CONSERVATISM IN VICTORIA.

It may seem at the first blush that there is no reason why a democratic country should not be conservative, and even every reason why, if democratic institutions are working well, all classes alike should wish to maintain the existing order. This theory, however, rests on an assumption which is practically never realised and incapable of realisation, that a political order left to itself will maintain itself by simple *vis inertiae*. It cannot do so, because the balance of classes, property, intelligence, is perpetually shifting even in the most stagnant community; a wealthy class is increasing with the accumulation of property or diminishing with the depression of trade; fortunes are becoming concentrated or subdivided under the operation of law or natural circumstance; and thought vibrates as the political leader of the day is a Guizot or a Gambetta. Therefore political Conservatism in any country means a determination to let natural changes work in whatever direction they will, without interference from legislation; and this means for a Democracy that government by the majority shall be superseded, tacitly or openly, by the government of the minority. Such a change is certain to have many unconscious and many avowed supporters.

The unconscious supporters in Victoria are the large class who were driven into political action in the early days of the colony by imperious political needs; men who had known at home what it meant to be without votes, often without work, and always without the chance of acquiring land, and for whom universal suffrage and vote by ballot meant nothing less, in their own estimation at least, than the power to earn wages and form homes in their adopted country. At present those needs have been partially satisfied. The early restrictions on mining have been mitigated; a protective tariff has been established, and is supposed to foster native industry; and a portion of the land has been thrown open for settlement. The struggling working-men of five-and-twenty years back have become in thousands of instances substantial yeomen, or partners in mining enterprise, or foremen of factories, or store-keepers. Democracy has given them what they want, and they feel grateful to it, and would resent any open attack upon it, but are not disposed to carry it out in new directions, to supplement a Land Act by a progressive land tax, or to add high schools to primary schools. The children of these men are, it is likely, even more apathetic. No one born in Australia can form any real idea of the squalor in which a large part of the population of the British Isles live habitually, and of the unrelenting toil by which the greater part of the remainder are kept, day by day, from sinking into that squalor. Least of all is it understood that the poverty of Britain is due very much to British

institutions, and to causes that may very easily be reproduced in a new country; to the concentration of land in a few hands, to imperfect education, to the Poor Laws, and to the fact that the population at large is governed by a few hundred gentlemen who are chosen almost without exception from a class that has no experience of poverty, and that is largely interested in the existing order.

The disposition to political quietude is fostered by the regard to law which more than twenty years of unbroken order have intensified. I am not speaking of the absence of crime, but of the absence of disorder under circumstances that provoke to it among other English-speaking communities. Two instances will explain what I mean. In February, 1876, the Government of the day (Sir James M'Culloch's) proposed and carried the adoption of the French system of the *clôture*, with the view of expediting business and stifling unpleasant discussion. So far as can be judged from their conduct afterwards, when they rejected a great number of the "gaggers," as those who voted for the *clôture* were called, the constituencies strongly disapproved of this encroachment on liberty of discussion. Yet the signs of popular fermentation were so slight that the sharpest-sighted supporters of the Ministry misunderstood the feeling they had provoked, till the moment when the result of the next elections made it unmistakable. It almost seemed as if there could be no deep feeling where there were no gatherings in the streets, no angry crowds menacing unpopular members, no outward manifestation of wrath, beyond the hisses from a few knots of working-men that greeted the more prominent obstructionists for a few nights. A second instance is even stronger. In December, 1877, the Legislative Council threw out the Appropriation Bill, and Mr. Berry's Government proceeded in consequence (January, 1878) to dismiss several hundred civil servants, partly to economise funds and partly to intimidate the Council. Public feeling rose high on either side. The great mass of the population sided with the Government and the Assembly against the Council, and to some extent was not indisposed to see the overgrown and overbearing Civil Service summarily dealt with. On the other hand, the Conservative party, which had never counted on being met so vigorously, was furious at seeing an expected victory snatched out of its grasp; and the wealthier portion of the community sympathised strongly with the sufferers, who were placed between hammer and anvil through no fault of their own. This time public meetings abounded, and would no doubt have been more numerous still, but that the Conservatives were everywhere in a hopeless minority. It was a period of violent tension, during which even civil war seemed possible, and when the Governor and Premier were constantly threatened or warned that their lives were in danger. But the only disorderly

incidents that marked the two months of protracted bitterness were two trifling assaults on persons disturbing political meetings, and some stones thrown by a mob of boys on the evening of an election at the windows of two Conservative journals. Those who noted what lately took place in England when the Liberal view of foreign policy became unpopular, and those who remember the religious riots of Montreal, the riots during the Slavery agitation in half the great cities of the Union, and even the violence with which the recent agitation for silver as a legal tender has been accompanied in the Far West, will I think admit that Victoria may plume itself on the orderly habits of its population. It is the natural outcome of democratic institutions in a small community, where men can easily count heads so as to satisfy themselves that they are the majority, and that the triumph of their will is only matter of time. But it may incidentally have the effect of strengthening a Conservative Government, which, knowing that the people can never be provoked into a disorderly protest, may restrain their liberties under colour of law. In fact, had Sir James M'Culloch profited by his year of almost absolute power to enlarge the basis of the Council, so as to give it a greater hold on the country, and coupled this with one or two trifling reforms, parties among us would be more evenly divided, the Council would be stronger, and the difficulties of the present position would be almost insuperable.

Besides the influences of long-continued prosperity and of the habit of order, both of which tend insensibly to make change difficult, there are of course many persons and some classes in Victoria that are undisguisedly Conservative. Ever since the foundation of the colony the influence of the judges and police magistrates almost without exception has been in this direction; partly because the legal profession, governing itself chiefly by precedent, always leans to Conservatism; partly because its heads, being rivals in power of the Government, are apt in a small community to show some jealousy of it; and partly from the accident that some prominent lawyers among us have been strongly Conservative by conviction. The Judges of the Supreme Court in a young country enjoy a position of exceptional power and influence, though in one trifling respect, the conditions of leave of absence, they are less independent than the English judges, and though their salaries are inferior. The Chief Justice, or Acting Chief Justice, ranks next to the Governor, and takes his place whenever he leaves the colony. He and his brethren are irremovable except on address of the two Houses to the Governor, and are not overshadowed or rivalled within the colony by members of the Royal Family, or by bishops, generals, or admirals. The punctilious etiquette which to some extent banishes the English judges even from private society except of a rather

intimate kind, which altogether keeps them from the platform, and which obliges them to guard their words, spoken or written, with the extremest care, would be impossible and unpopular in a young country ; and the Victorian judge goes about much like other men, assists on commissions, takes the chair at public gatherings, and, it may be, delivers addresses on social or literary questions. If he has been an ardent politician before his elevation to the Bench, he perhaps retains his political interests, and counsels his party in private, contributes articles on their behalf to a newspaper or magazine, and possibly falls into rank with Liberals or Conservatives when they are making social war upon the Government. All this, it may be said, is no dereliction of duty ; nor do I wish to argue that even the most questionable of these infringements of English etiquette, the writing of political articles, ought to be forbidden by any hard and fast rule. It is a dangerous practice, for a case might easily happen where an action for libel should be set down for trial in a court where the judge was himself the libeller, and where the reason of his refusal to sit would be instantly surmised, while the scandal of an adverse judgment even on technical grounds would be very great. But, on the other hand, there are no doubt cases in a small community where a particular judge might be the only person qualified to write on a projected reform ; and so long as he wrote temperately, it would be better that he should not withhold his counsel, and desirable that he should withhold his name. Meanwhile it will be conceded that judges possessing so much weight of position as those in Victoria, and mixing with comparative unrestraint in politics, when they take an interest in politics, are a sensible force in the world of public opinion. Inasmuch as this force is at present Conservative, though it may cease at any time to be so by new appointments, we must take it into account in estimating the strength of Victorian Conservatism.

There is another way in which the Conservatism of the Bench acts upon public opinion. The formation of case-law, which is going on every day the courts are open, cannot fail to influence legislation and opinion. The Bench holding, I will assume, that a new law is bad or impracticable, sneers at it in court, and declines to interpret according to its spirit ; or again, where it is no case of new legislation, follows conservative precedents against the last and more liberal decisions. I remember an instance in South Australia where a judge who objected to the powers given to stipendiary magistrates, paralysed their action for a time, till a validating Act could be procured from England. The Real Property Act, which has been the charter of small landed proprietorship in Australia, was extremely distasteful for years to the legal profession, and has only been kept in successful operation by the most restless jealousy on

the part of the South Australian Legislature. In a case of libel against a Liberal newspaper I have heard a Victorian judge charge the jury that a writer must satisfy himself by investigation in England of the truth of certain currently assumed facts, before he could be justified in discussing them. In a case where the wife asked for a divorce, and established a strong case against her husband as unfaithful, drunken, and cruel, the judge summed up for the defendant on grounds which practically assumed that the indissolubility of the marriage bond must be maintained under all but the most extreme circumstances. It must be distinctly understood that I not only do not impugn this decision as influenced by personal or political considerations, but believe that the judge triumphed over both in making it; and that he asserted what he regarded as a supreme law of morality against a man whose private character and professed political and religious views he probably held in abhorrence. My case is not that there is any want of integrity in our judicature, but that our judges are mostly of the Eldon and Ellenborough school of Conservatism, rather than like a Mansfield or a Cockburn, disposed to go back to the principles on which statute-law is based.

Circumstances have made the legal profession very powerful in Victoria. In spite of occasional periods of depression, the country has generally been rich enough to look beyond present needs in framing its establishments; and it has provided a judicial system that would have sufficed at the time of its greatest extent for four times the population. Besides this, as the State registers all titles and transfers of land, and all charges upon it, a good deal of work is done by civil servants that would be discharged in England by private practitioners. Altogether, in 1876, there were nearly two hundred persons holding legal or quasi-legal situations under the Crown, who were in receipt of incomes from £300 to £3,500 a year, apparently a large number for a colony whose population was only eight hundred and fifty thousand. It has been said that the police magistrates in Victoria are generally Conservative; and to the general reasons I have assigned, and to those by which De Tocqueville has explained the same feature in America, I will add one cause which I think is of constant operation. The police magistrate finds his authority perpetually assailed from the democratic side. In a small community, where the importance of the individual elector is great, and where the minister of justice and the legislature can spare a good deal of time for the discussion of personal squabbles, an aggrieved litigant constantly threatens to bring the conduct of the presiding magistrate before the Minister or Parliament, and once in a thousand times succeeds in doing it. Probably the result is to confirm the magistrate's decision, but it is not in human nature that a judge

should not resent perpetual attempts to overrule his authority by a decision outside a court of justice. He knows that his own motives were good, and that his decision was right, and though he would be the first to admit that this liability to denunciation is not practically formidable, and does not make his decisions less fearless and upright than they should be, he is galled by them, and regards them as the natural outcome of a Democracy, though they are in fact just as much the natural outcome of a small society. So it happens that the prevailing tone of the numerous office-bearers in the legal profession is predominatingly Conservative; and as the police magistrate is a person of great importance in his district—not of course equal to the French prefect, but of far greater account than any English official—we must class the influence of police magistrates among those that promote Conservatism in Victoria.

The absence of an Established Church has been noted as one of the causes that have favoured the growth of Democracy in Victoria. But the various religious denominations are liable to political partisanship, and their aggregate influence is perhaps greater than that of the sects in England, the sceptical English upper class and the godless artisan population of the English large towns being alike unrepresented among us. How strong the Puritan element is in Victoria may be inferred from the facts that no Sunday trains are allowed on the State railways,<sup>1</sup> that all public institutions are closed on that day, that even a large Melbourne library supported by private subscription is closed by vote of the subscribers, and that public-houses are closed by law (though not everywhere in practice) throughout the day to all except *bonâ-fide* travellers. Now, although the principal churches were for many years assisted by State aid, and have received most liberal grants of land from the State, they are at present altogether dependent upon their respective congregations for support. The effect of this is, that the leading clergy mix very much with their parishioners, and necessarily take their tone in great measure from these. It would be against human nature if a man ignorant or careless of Victorian politics, as the clergy very often are, should not be influenced by the opinions of men whom he meets every week, who are his foremost supporters in all Church matters, and who, as the common phrase is, have a large stake in the country. During the last year the Conservative clergy have preached freely from the pulpit against the Liberal party, and have not scrupled to appear on the platform and take a very decided part in elections. As a rule it may be said that the Anglican and Presbyterian ministers are Conservative almost without exception; and as these gentlemen number nearly half the registered clergy, and preach to more than a third of

(1) This was the case when I wrote this article; but since then the State has purchased a private railway, and has not discontinued the Sunday trains now on it.

the church-going population, their influence is an important element in the political world. Nor is it fairly balanced by the Liberal sympathies of other denominations, for the Catholic clergy know no distinction except that of friend or foe to the Church; and even the Wesleyans, who are habitually Liberal, are apt to prefer a religiously sound Conservative to an unorthodox Liberal. I must beg my readers to remember that I do not for a moment object to this state of things. It is a most legitimate influence of property that its possessors, in most cases, should acquire culture of manner and education, and should, in consequence, possess an indirect influence over those who are nominally their spiritual guides. Nor, again, can I desire that a man who has come by political views anyhow should abstain from expressing them in the pulpit. Liberals have the press and the platform open to them, and must be content if once and again some spiritual disciple of Arnold, Maurice, Kingsley, or Fraser should arise to brave professional ruin by denouncing land-jobbing and the lust of money from the pulpit. Hereafter, when a high culture has been more universally diffused, it is possible that no Church will remain predominatingly Conservative. Meanwhile I think it may fairly be said that though no sect in Victoria has the power of the Established Church in the country districts of England, the Churches to which the rich mostly belong are a Conservative force in Victoria.

Spain, which is a country of anomalies, is, I believe, the only country in the world where bankers have not been habitually Conservative; and as the reason of the exception is to be sought in the large profits which Spanish bankers used to derive from floating loans, or from making advances to embarrassed governments, we may probably disregard it. A banker in a young country can scarcely fail to be oligarchical and conservative in his tendencies. In early days he is practically and sometimes officially one of the governing members of the community. Administrations can scarcely exist if he is hostile; every prominent man of the community borrows from him or from some other banker like-minded with himself, and the branch banks multiply this influence over every section and every district of the community. It is often said in Europe that Rothschild will not allow such or such a policy to be followed; and no doubt the assumption is sometimes true, though, if the question be one of war, I am inclined to think that national passions commonly carry the day against expediency. It is much truer that in Australia the banks and the loan and discount companies form a very noticeable political force, which is constantly employed to obstruct Liberal measures. Let me assume that the question is one of a land-tax of a shilling in the pound, and that the banks dislike this partly because their wealthiest customers dislike it, and partly because it diminishes the value of their securities by five per cent. There are two per-

fectly legal and unobtrusive ways in which a banker may damage the Government. He may send round a circular to his branch managers, and instruct them, without assigning reasons, to restrict the advances they are making. This by itself will cause commercial anxiety and embarrassment, which will tell on the popularity of the administration. But if this remedy is insufficient, he and his agents can drop casual hints, forced out of them as it were, that the state of the political world is such as to make capitalists uneasy, and that unless there is some change, money is likely to remain tight. The course expedient of telling a man that his bills shall not be renewed because he is a Liberal is not unknown in Australia, but is of course rare and dangerous. Lastly, bankers and all who advance money have exceptional power in a colony, because it is largely dependent for money on English capitalists whom these gentlemen advise. During the late dead-lock letters from Melbourne were freely used for political purposes in England; and had the effect which the writers designed been produced and Victorian securities depreciated, the recoil in Australia would have been considerable. But the common-sense of the English commercial world took stock of the situation very calmly. Men who knew nothing of the contest between the two Houses, perceived that there was no disorder, and no suspension of payments to foreign creditors; that the manifestoes of the Assembly were temperate and dignified, and that the Governor was neutral.

We may now add to these considerable influences of men important by position or by their command of money, the great social influence which accompanies the wealthy classes. It is professional ruin for almost any barrister, doctor, or schoolmaster in Melbourne to express sympathy with the Liberal party. Australian society is not inherently worse than English in these respects. If anything, it is, I believe, better and more kindly-natured. But it is at present so wanting in variety and so small, that it does not afford space for the broad divisions that are possible in a great country. Moreover, as its prominent and wealthiest members are in many instances self-made men, they are often grotesquely ignorant of views that are rapidly gaining ground among educated men in Europe. Mr. Mill's doctrine that the State has a claim on the unearned increment in land; Professor Cliffe Leslie's defence of peasant proprietorship in France; M. de Laveleye's parallel line of argument that the State should keep the national domain in its own hands, were all greeted with a howl of wrath as "communistic," when they were first reproduced in Victoria by local orators and writers. The feelings of two or three hundred half-educated men who find their projects of money-getting interfered with, who are quite ignorant that the ideas they dislike are mere commonplaces among economists, and who,



from the habit of rule over dependants, are disposed to bluster down all opposition in the political world also, may easily be imagined. If the offender be a newspaper editor, an attempt is made to withdraw all advertisements from his paper; if a barrister, he is refused briefs; if a clergyman, or schoolmaster, or tradesman, his congregation, or his pupils, or his wealthiest customers desert him. The more delicate social influence is even more powerful. I do not for a moment believe that women are born Conservatives, but I think that women, educated as those in a colony mostly are, not quite so well as their brothers, unaccustomed to serious study, and married young, are always likely to take their tone on political matters from those who have succeeded in the world, and on whom the success of their own husbands depends, and at whose houses they visit. I should be inclined to claim from ten to twenty per cent. of the professional class as secretly Liberal; but outside the family circles of prominent Liberals, I doubt if there is any appreciable Liberal feeling among women in the well-to-do classes of society.

Last of all, it must be borne in mind that Victoria is to some extent sensitive to the flux and reflux of political thought in England, and of course to English changes of Ministry. Liberal leaders in the colony are forced habitually to bear in mind that any projects of organic change they may entertain are liable to be reviewed by an unsympathetic stranger; and though the disposition in Downing Street is to leave the colonies to themselves, this is to some extent counterbalanced by the pressure of absentee colonists, who are much like absentee landlords everywhere, selfish and reactionary. Mr. Cardwell's recall of Sir Charles Darling, although the Home Government justified it by motives outside the point in dispute, had the effect of throwing back constitutional reform for several years, and has been a determining cause of subsequent dead-locks. Even the defeat of the Gladstone Ministry was eagerly welcomed by the Conservative journals of Melbourne as a blow to Australian Liberalism, and Mr. Gladstone is from time to time assailed in the colonial press, almost as bitterly as he is in London. Above all, it is noticed that wealthy colonists who have visited England are apt to return with a stronger sense of class differences, and a more pronounced dislike to national institutions, than they had when they left; and this is so especially the case if they have received any trifling honour from the English Government, that no man who values political influence in Victoria would now venture to accept knighthood.

### III.—THE VICTORIAN CONSTITUTION.

When Victoria became too large to be governed any longer from Sydney, the constitution first given it by the Home Government

provided only for a single Chamber. Lord Grey, whose views, from their definiteness, have influenced the Colonial Office, even when he was not in power, held that it was impossible in young countries to find the class from which a second Chamber could be constructed, and undesirable to follow the lines of the English constitution, where substantial correspondence could not be insured. The Chamber that governed Victoria for five years (November 11, 1851, to November 21, 1856) was composed of two-thirds elected members, and a third nominees of the Crown, and numbered fifty-four in all before its dissolution. It cannot be said that this Chamber, though somewhat anomalous in its constitution, worked badly, or forfeited popularity during its short tenure of life. But a petition from the Legislative Council of New South Wales, couched in such strong language that it was a question whether the House of Commons could receive it, drew attention in England to the inadequacy of the representation that had been conceded to the oldest Australian colony. The English Cabinet determined to offer new constitutions to all the more important members of the Australian group. This time the offer was saddled with a stipulation that the new Parliaments should each have two Chambers. We may probably ascribe this change of policy to the influence of Sir W. Molesworth, who had advocated the bi-cameral systems in the English Parliament. But it is also likely, I think, that the Council would under any circumstances have followed the model of the old country in adopting two Chambers.

But though it is easy to have two Chambers, it is not easy to assign them their respective provinces, so that neither shall encroach on or overlap the other. Three models for a second Chamber were present to the thoughts of all the debaters on the Constitution Act: the English House of Lords, the American Senate, and the nominee Council that had been tried in various Crown colonies. Of these the Senate, which represents the principle of State rights in a federation, was not appropriate to Victoria; the nominee principle was unpopular from experience; and the House of Lords manifestly could not be reproduced with complete exactness. One or two fancy schemes were propounded. The Secretary inclined to the plan (favoured by Wilhelm von Humboldt) of a representation of classes, merchants, professional men, &c.; and another member suggested a scheme, which works after a fashion in Guatemala, by which the House of Representatives was to elect a second Chamber. But these theories found no effectual support, and the Council ended by recommending that a Chamber, which it called a Council, should be composed of men of property, chosen by electors with a fairly high qualification, should sit for ten years, should be indissoluble while it sat, should be unable to initiate or to amend money bills,

but should be able to alter or originate other bills, and to reject measures of every kind at pleasure. The obvious points of difference between this Chamber and a House of Lords seem to be that the Council was not hereditary, possessed no judicial powers, and no privileges except such as are enjoyed by the House of Commons, and could not be added to by creations, as it was not called into existence by the Crown. But the question whether it was intended to be a Representative Chamber was left undecided, and probably was not heeded. The preamble of the Constitution Act appears to distinguish between the Council and the Representative Assembly, as if they were essentially different. One party accordingly contends that the Council is merely elected by a moderately large constituency, because that mode of choice is thought preferable to nomination by the Crown, but that it is no more representative in its character than the judges of New York, or the civil servants of Zurich, who are also elected. On the other hand, those who favour the highest claims to power of the Council maintain that it is a second House of Commons, with co-ordinate powers and jurisdiction to the House of Assembly, and that as a Representative House it ought to have the right of amending money bills.

Concerning the Assembly, no one questions that it was designed upon the model of the English House of Commons, though, of course, it cannot contract international relations, or coin money, or impeach Ministers (as there is no Upper House of Lords with judicial powers to hear an impeachment). Neither again, if the Council possesses co-ordinate powers with the Assembly, can it be said that the position of this latter body is as dignified as that of the English House of Commons. As, however, the want of Imperial powers is unimportant to a colony, and as the Council's claims have never been admitted, the House of Assembly reproduces the English Lower House with tolerable fidelity. But at a very early stage it acquired a different character, as the property qualification for members and for electors was abolished, the ballot was introduced to insure secrecy, and the duration of Parliaments was reduced from five to three years.<sup>1</sup> Every one of these changes tended, it will be seen, in the direction of Democracy. The Council did not oppose them, holding that they were questions which affected the Assembly rather than the collective Parliament, and at this time not caring to interfere when the other Chamber was only dealing with its own constitution. But it cannot be said that the Council was itself unaffected by the changes.

(1) Mr. Huines proposed the introduction of Manhood Suffrage, 1857. Mr. O'Shanassy carried the Abolition of Members' Qualification in the same year. Vote by Ballot was carried in the Assembly by Mr. Nicholson in 1857, and became law; and the Act for Triennial Parliaments was carried by the O'Shanassy Ministry in 1858.

Inasmuch as the Assembly had renounced all regard for property qualifications, the Council not unnaturally began to regard itself as the especial guardian of property; and its own members have sometimes stated or implied that it represents property.<sup>1</sup> Then, again, the direct influence of employers over electors was almost annihilated by the introduction of secret voting, so that the Assembly came to represent the wage-receiving classes of society in larger measure than it had done before. Last of all, men who were certain to go back to their constituents in three years at most, became of necessity more sensitive to changes of public opinion than those whose seats were secure for five years.

But under all abatements the Assembly has been regarded in the country as the popular and powerful House, and is the Chamber to which energetic men possessed of a large influence in the country naturally desire to be elected. Were it not for the Land Question and the Free Trade Question the Assembly would probably contain every influential man who cares for politics. As it is, rich land-owners and merchants find themselves disqualified before popular constituencies by their dislike of a land-tax, or of a liberal Land Act, or of a restrictive tariff, and accordingly procure their election to the Council as the best means by which they may retain an influence in politics. Mr. Cracroft pointed out in 1867<sup>2</sup> that land, which at first sight appeared to have only 256 members in the House of Commons, had really some 500 members, and it may be doubted whether the popular House in England does not represent more wealth comparatively than the House of Peers. But no one could raise any question of this sort about the Victorian Chambers. It is a constant taunt against the Liberal party, which numbers nearly three-fourths of the votes, that not one of their members is independent of a profession or a trade, and there are several in the same position among the wealthier Conservative minority. But nearly half the Council are land-owners, and a large proportion of the remainder are wealthy importers. University graduates and professional men are not very numerous in either Chamber. But the present Council contains two barristers and three actual or retired solicitors, and of these three are university graduates. The present Assembly contains eight barristers and four solicitors, eleven journalists, a medical man, four engineers, and three schoolmasters, and nine of these are university graduates. On the whole I think it may be said

(1) "Does not this House expressly represent property?"—Sir F. Murphy, May 20, 1874. "This House . . . may be regarded as established to specially represent and protect the interests of property."—Sir S. Wilson, Oct. 2, 1877. "Since the property qualification of members of the Assembly had been abolished, it was all the more necessary that the Council should have a controlling voice over the expenditure."—Mr. Miller, Nov. 18, 1877.

(2) *Essays on Reform.*

that the Assembly represents the higher level of intelligence, energy, and education, though the Council unquestionably contains more men who have risen by their own efforts to the possession of large property.

The checks that prevent a collision of the two Houses in England are very numerous and important. There are the enduring memories of revolutionary procedure; of the time when the House of Lords was abolished by a resolution of the House of Commons; of Monk's refusal to let the Peers meet again till the Commons had rescinded their vote; of the way in which Harley swamped the Peers by new creations; of William IV.'s constrained acquiescence in Lord Grey's proposal to carry the Reform Bill by a similar expedient; and of the Duke of Wellington's counsel that the Peers should renounce an impracticable opposition to the popular will. But I do not suppose it can be said that the Peers are consciously influenced by the dread of revolutionary measures. They know that the House of Commons would never, except in the last resort, revive the precedent of the Long Parliament, and that the experiment of swamping is more easily talked of than accomplished. Had Lord Grey, for instance, attempted to create on a large scale, he would have alienated many of his supporters among the Lords, and would have made the Upper House so unwieldy as to defy swamping in the future. The reason why English Conservative Peers acquiesce in the passing of measures which they dislike and think dangerous, as the abolition of a Church Establishment or the remodelling of land tenures, must therefore be sought, I believe, in other causes. In the first place they are accustomed to yield. Every right which the House of Commons possesses, from the granting of money aids to the regulation of foreign policy, was once possessed by the Peers, and has been gradually but surely wrested from them. In the next place the Lords have no pretension to represent any class of the community except their own. A Peer still sits in virtue of his barony,<sup>1</sup> and speaks for himself, the most dignified of royal counsellors, removed by hereditary rank from the fear of royal caprice and from the necessity of courting public favour. The position may seem a tame one for those who think nothing dignified except a positive control of legislative action, but it may be questioned if the temperate opposition of a few thoughtful debaters, who rise only to dissect and criticise the measures they dislike, and who rarely exercise their legal power of obstructing them in critical cases, does not make the retarding power of the Peers a very formidable reality. In the first

(1) Of course the bishops, who have now no baronies, and whose continuance in the House of Lords is therefore a curious anomaly, must be excepted from this. But though the Scotch and Irish Peers do not represent each his own barony, they do, I think, represent baronies in general, in their respective countries.

place it obliges the Commons to consider their amendments very favourably, and in the next place it prepares the way for reaction, whenever the inevitable recoil comes and the success of the popular measure proves to be a little less than was anticipated. The country has accomplished its act of justice or policy, the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, let us say, and it finds that Irish Catholics are not rapturously grateful over a deferred act of equity, that Irish and English Protestants are noisily discontented, and that when vested interests have been compensated there will be little or no residue from Church property for public purposes. Men begin to ask themselves whether the Lords were not practically right in their denunciatory criticisms, and to believe that a few doctrinaire enthusiasts have hurried the country into an act that was perhaps abstractedly right, but was neither necessary nor expedient.

Last of all, it must be borne in mind that the English Peers as an order have an unchangeable interest in the fortunes of England. They are not cosmopolitan, like wealthy English commoners or Australians or Americans. At present the ablest among them start from a vantage-ground of twenty years in life over their untitled competitors, and have opportunities of distinction in military or naval command, as ambassadors or governors of provinces, which enable them to pass all but men of exceptional talent or protracted service. The most ordinary of English noblemen, so long as he conforms to common social and moral rules, is surrounded in his own neighbourhood by something of the divinity which doth fence a king. Men so situated will not readily risk their position by fighting for shadows or for rights which their predecessors have abandoned. They argue very sensibly that it is much better to recognise tenant-right in Ireland than to provoke a passionate controversy in which the Commons will appeal to the people, in which the Lords must ultimately give way, and the end of which may be that the principle of tenant-right will be asserted for the whole Empire. The higher-minded among them know that as hereditary counsellors and all but administrators in the greatest Empire of the world, they occupy a position for good, which must be maintained even at the price of heavy concessions now and again to popular feeling. The wiser-minded know that their titles and their fortunes make up only a small portion of their importance, and that if they ceased to be senators they would be overshadowed in many cases by the men who have made colossal fortunes in shoddy or wool or on the Stock Exchange. It has been said that good Americans when they die go to Paris; and in fact, for mere wealth without position, the capital of refinement and pleasure seems to be an appropriate heaven. But it is difficult to imagine that an English Peer could ever find heaven where there was no House of Lords.

Now the Legislative Council of Victoria differs in almost every particular from the English House of Peers, which it was designed to reproduce, or for which it is a substitute. There is scarcely a memory of disorder in Victoria, and the one civil broil that was provoked by excessive incompetency ended in the decisive triumph of the military. The Council, in virtue of its constitution, cannot be swamped by new creations; and having been created by an external power, the English Parliament, believes that no other body can annul or alter it. Its short history is a record of constant and mostly successful encroachment or opposition. It has sacrificed nothing, and it has laid claim, often successfully, to privileges that in popular apprehension belong only to the Assembly, to amend money bills or refuse the supplies. Its members, in virtue of their longer tenure of their seats, and because they cannot be dissolved, have a great advantage in all contests with the Assembly—the strength of the limpet clinging firmly to its rock against the tide. With this power to obstruct, the whole importance of the Council is bound up. Its members as such have scarcely any importance within the colony, and none whatever outside it. The compensations of rank, of administrative influence, of professional promotion for their families, are not for them. They lose nothing if they renounce their legislative honours and transfer themselves to London or Paris. Their antecedents and talents do not fit them in any eminent degree for the critical work which the English Peers perform. They have been successful as money-makers, not as thinkers or debaters, as administrators, or, for the most part, as professional men. They are conscious that if they claimed, like English Peers, to sit in their own right only, they would fall immeasurably short of the power which they can claim as representatives of a class, however limited. Hence their theory of their own position is almost necessarily that of a co-ordinate quasi-popular House, and is maintained by decisive acts of obstruction or interference. They do not care to counsel or to suggest, because they are all-powerful to veto.

Altogether, during twenty-two years of legislative activity, the Council has rejected eighty-three bills, and amended twenty-three out of existence.<sup>1</sup> But this enumeration conveys a very imperfect idea of the Council's influence as a retarding force. It maintained State aid to religion during fifteen years, and enabled the favoured denomination to withdraw on singularly good terms, the continuance of the grant for five years more, and the unconditional acquisition of lands that had been granted in trust for Church purposes. It has thrown out, or mutilated till they were useless, six bills for Mining on Private Property. It has thrown out an Electoral Bill, and a Tariff Bill that had been passed by large majorities. It has

(1) Speech of Major Smith, Aug. 21, 1878.

seven times thrown out Payment of Members. It has rejected four Appropriation Bills and one Temporary Supply Bill. It has thrown out a bill to provide for the defence of the country at a time when invasion was imminent. Minor measures, however popular or sound, have not been more ceremoniously treated. A bill for an international exhibition at Melbourne was contemptuously thrown out on the plea that a Protectionist colony had nothing to exhibit, and a bill for abolishing dower, because the Conservative leader had not had time to master its principles. But the influence of the Council has been equally real in changing the character of bills that it has consented to pass. Every Land Bill must contain a sop to the squatting interest. That of 1862 (the Duffy Act) contained a clause by which the squatters were enabled to purchase in other men's names, and that of 1867 gave ten years' leases of twenty million acres, at three halfpence an acre, to the privileged class. After this last bill had been passed, two important Land-Law Amending Acts were rejected by the Council; and their action, which might be defended on general grounds, provoked the reproach, under the circumstances, that they were obstructive because they had nothing to gain by a compromise.

Of course all these statements are not complete in themselves, and admit of being traversed. "The Council," says a former and honoured member, "gave up its opposition to the withdrawal of State aid after a resistance of fifteen years' duration; but during that period the feelings of the Assembly upon it fluctuated considerably, and on one occasion they had so altered that the bill was lost on the second reading in the Assembly itself." It is certain that such a question as the endowment of religion is always likely to divide a community into two hostile camps; and inasmuch as the four most favoured denominations<sup>1</sup> number at least three-fourths of the population, it might be expected that they would fight hard to maintain a position of privilege and profit. But allowing for this, the evidence seems to be very strong that the mass of people objected to State aid. It was almost the only point in the Constitution Act that excited strong public feeling at the time that measure was framed. The bill to abolish it was one of the first measures carried in the first Victorian Parliament, and was sent up three times in five years (1857, 1859, 1861). Then, not unnaturally perhaps, its supporters lost heart under their defeats, and public attention was diverted to land-laws, protective tariffs, and constitutional struggles. So it was that a bill introduced by a private member was thrown out in a year when the Assembly was in the thick of its first contest with the Council, and when many members may reasonably have thought that

(1) At the time of the abolitions seven religious bodies were in receipt of State aid. The Baptists, Independents, Bible-Christians, Welsh Calvinists, and Jews were the chief denominations excluded by law, or practically, from its benefits.



it was inexpedient to add to the causes of discord between the two Houses. But when dead-locks were ended for a time by compromises (1866—1868) public interest in the question of Church endowments soon revived; and a bill to abolish them was carried by forty-seven in a House of sixty-eight (1869), and thrown out by fourteen to eight in the Council, chiefly, it would seem, on the ground that the terms granted to the sects were not good enough. Next year a bill which continued the grant in full for five years, in place of reducing it by £10,000 a year, as the former bill had done, passed the Assembly and the Council. Conservatives still maintain here and there that the bill was one upon which public opinion was much divided, and which the Council might legitimately retard. Liberals hold that the opinion of the community has never varied on the general policy of the bill, and that it was an additional proof how badly the Council works, that it was able, by resolute obstructiveness, to dishearten men who were asserting a sound principle, and who never wavered in their allegiance to it. I need hardly point out that there have been similar oscillations in England about many important bills, and that Catholic Emancipation, Criminal Law Reform, and the removal of Jewish Disabilities have excited very different interest at different times.

The objection to the Act for Mining on Private Property "is," says Mr. A'Becket, "that it overrides unjustifiably the rights of property." The question is no doubt a difficult one. As the Supreme Court of Victoria and the Privy Council have agreed that the State, in all sales of land that it has made, has reserved the right to the gold and silver on the land, there is no longer any real discussion as to this point. As, however, the State never reserved the right to enter upon the land for mining purposes, it is contended that no one can obtain the ore on it without consent of the land-owner, who is thus the trustee, so to speak, of a deposit which he cannot himself use, but which no one can use without his consent. He accordingly claims not only to be compensated for any loss he may sustain, directly or consequentially, by mining, but to be paid for permitting the right of entry; and this right is so highly valued that the Council has rejected an amendment by which the State might resume land supposed to be auriferous at double the value of the land regarded as unauriferous. In fact, a case is known<sup>1</sup> where the lucky possessor of only three hundred acres has received £100,000 as royalty for allowing private adventurers to extract gold that belonged in law to the State; and successive Administrations have been fain to connive at and validate bargains of this kind. The last bill sent up from the Assembly proposed to subject past agreements of this kind to revision by one or other of the contracting parties, and by the State, so that theoretically<sup>2</sup> a land-owner might make a better bar-

(1) Speech of Major Smith, August 8, 1877.

(2) Theoretically: because it is difficult to suppose that any Minister in a democratic

gain for himself; practically a mining lessee might do it, and the State might revise every agreement on considerations of general policy. The bill miscarried, apparently on this issue. Meanwhile the loss to the country is very great; many thousand acres of auriferous land are locked up in private hands, the possessors trusting that some compromise will be made under which their claims to a royalty shall be recognised; and as the State no longer sells land supposed to be auriferous, its tenants who lease it, and are obliged to lease it, in the mining districts, can get no value for any improvements they make if they leave the district. There is a complete paralysis of enterprise on what should be the most valuable part of the territory.

But the rejection of four Appropriation Bills within twelve years is undoubtedly the strongest instance of the powers claimed and exercised by the Council. Already in the first year of its Parliamentary life (1857) the Council threatened to throw out an Appropriation Bill, which was sent up after the money had been already spent; and even at that early period the ideas that the Council had higher powers than the House of Lords, and ought to be allowed to amend money bills, were freely mooted. Some years later (1860) a barrister, who had come to adopt extreme Conservative opinions, Mr. Deniston Wood, advised the Government of the day, whose Attorney-General he was, that in his opinion the only money bill which the Council could not meddle with was one imposing and appropriating a duty; and another high legal authority, Mr. Fellows, confirmed this view at a later date.<sup>1</sup> In conformity with these opinions the M'Culloch Government in 1865 inserted a Tax Bill in an Appropriation Bill, the Speaker ruling that it was not a tack, as it was not the introduction of foreign matter.<sup>2</sup> Whatever legal or constitutional warrant there might be for the course taken, the Government avowed that they took it because it was known that the Council was hostile to the abolition of an export duty on gold, and to a protective tariff. In other words, as it was understood that the Council would disregard the votes of the Assembly and the wishes of the community as to the best way of raising revenue, Ministers determined to put it in the dilemma that it must disorganize the public service if it interfered with the tariff. The position was a difficult one. The Council might equitably plead that if this practice were allowed, it would never be able to reject a tax; and the Assembly could retort that if the Council could reverse the whole fiscal policy of the Assembly, the entire control of taxation would be transferred to it. At this distance of time it seems unfortunate that the Tariff Bill was not in the first instance sent up separately;

country would dare to revise a bargain under which the private proprietor has already defrauded the State to his own benefit, and to the injury of the working population.

(1) Mr. Higinbotham's speech at Brighton.

(2) July 20, 1865. At the same time the Speaker warned the House that to combine Appropriation and Revenue in the same bill was contrary to the actual practice of the House of Commons.

but there was a good deal of bitter feeling between the two Houses even at that period ; and it was argued that time was short, and that if the Tariff was rejected it would bear the appearance of insult if it was immediately sent up again as part of another bill. The results were that the Council threw out the Appropriation Bill (July 25, 1865) by twenty to five ; the country was thrown into confusion, the Civil Service disorganized, and the whole framework of society would have been dissolved for a time, if Government had not hit upon the device of borrowing, and allowing its creditors to obtain unopposed judgments against it. After several months of disorder a conference was held between the two Houses (April 17, 1866), and a compromise was effected by which the Assembly gained the substantial points for which it had contended, the gold export duty and the tariff, but agreed to send them up separately, as it would have done in the first instance if it had had the same assurance.

Unhappily this dispute led to another. Sir Charles Darling, the Governor of Victoria, had acted throughout it in conformity with the advice of his Ministers, and had so drawn down upon himself the bitter hatred of the Conservative party, which expected and expects the Governor to interfere with administration as if Victoria were a Crown colony, and to side habitually with the richer inhabitants. The intrigues and representations of some of these gentlemen at home induced the Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Cardwell, to recall Sir Charles, on the ostensible grounds that he had allowed money to be procured by collusive law proceedings, and that he had expressed himself against the opposition in language that made it doubtful how far he could ever act with them if they obtained a majority in the country. Naturally the popular party resented Sir Charles's recall as a blow at themselves, and the Ministry placed a vote for £20,000 to Lady Darling on the estimates. The vote can only be treated with reference to the struggle going on ; for by itself it seems purely indefensible that a Governor should receive a grant of public money for his conduct during a political crisis. But the strong feeling that Sir Charles had suffered gross injustice, and that no Governor would dare to act constitutionally for the future, if his conduct ruined him in his profession, and if the community he had saved did nothing to compensate him, outbalanced calmer considerations, and the vote was supported throughout the country with even more warmth than had been kindled by the debate upon the tariff. It is known that Sir C. Darling's successor, Lord Canterbury, held the Assembly to be technically in the right, and advised the Secretary for the Colonies that the Council had no right to throw out an Appropriation Bill, because it contained a single objectionable item. But this opinion was not known at the time ; and after a second severe dead-lock (1867-1868), in which two

Appropriation Bills were thrown out, the Assembly practically gave way, under cover of Sir Charles's reinstatement in the Imperial service, which obliged him to decline a grant for any member of his family. It is, I think, possible to hold that the grant never ought to have been proposed;<sup>1</sup> and yet that the triumph of the Council, encouraging them as it did to take up higher pretensions than before, has been attended with most deplorable results to the colony.

In 1873 the struggle threatened to begin again, when the Council threw out an Electoral Act, which had passed the Assembly by large majorities, and which, as it dealt only with elections to the Assembly, might be considered a matter only for the determination of that Chamber. But an attempt in the next year to reform the Constitution Act by providing that the two Houses should vote together on disputed points failed, partly because the Assembly declined to let the Council interfere in any way with money bills, and partly because the Ministry had announced their programme so late that it only influenced a portion of the electorates. The Parliament of 1874 proved highly Conservative, and it was not until 1877, when a Liberal Ministry took office with an overpowering majority, that there was any chance of further collision between the two Houses. But this time the dead-lock was deliberately planned and led up to by the Legislative Council. It did not dare to take it on the Land Tax, as the country had shown an unmistakable determination that land should bear a portion of the general taxation, but it threw out or mutilated every other important bill sent up from the Assembly; a Railway Bill, a Fort and Armament Bill, a Bill for an Inter-Colonial Exhibition, a Mining on Private Property Bill, and a Bill to continue Payment of Members. The fight came upon this last measure, because the Council believed itself to be supported in this instance by public opinion, and because the Liberal Ministry, in their extreme desire to avoid a contest, refused every other challenge. Even here they vacillated to their own injury, and having at first determined to include the vote in the Appropriation Bill, agreed to send it up as a separate measure, on an assurance from the leader of opposition that the Council would pass it in this form. The extreme party in the Council insisted, however, as a further concession, that it should be struck out of the Estimates, and threw it out because it had not been (December 11). It was then sent up in the Appropriation Bill, and this was similarly thrown out (December 20). For Government to resign under these circumstances would have been absurd, as no one could take their place; and to dissolve the House of Assembly would have been to put its members to trouble and expense for no purpose, as a new election would only increase

(1) Of course, I do not mean that Sir Charles Darling should have been left without any recognition of his conduct, but that the money should have been raised by private subscription.

the Liberal majority. Neither, again, was the Government prepared to admit that the Council might at any time force a dissolution upon the Assembly, as such a concession would have left the popular House very much weaker than the House of Commons, and the proprietary Chamber very much stronger than the House of Lords. It accordingly prepared for a dead-lock, and began to husband its resources by dismissing several hundred civil servants, including the County Court judges and police magistrates. These latter dismissals, being illegal, were partially revoked; and the Ministry was the weaker for having made them. Generally, too, the reductions made were rather hastily planned, and were carried out in a brusque manner, that is highly to be regretted. But the instantaneous verdict of the great mass of the community was that the Government was right in refusing to dissolve, and right in retrenching, and that it must be supported in asserting the fundamental principle that the Council has no right to tamper with or reject Appropriation Bills. Public opinion, which had wavered on the subject of Payment of Members, hardened in its support; and after two months of dead-lock, during which many families had been impoverished, and the country had been on the brink of civil war, the Council was glad to accept the compromise first tendered, and pass the two bills separately.

The instances I have given will, I think, make it easy to understand why even many persons of Conservative temperament, who wish to see the Assembly held in check by a second Chamber, are yet fain to admit that the present relations of the two Houses are intolerable. But the Liberal case does not rest simply upon the acts of violence which the Council has committed. Every one will feel that great allowance must be made for cases in which vested interests are assailed; and it may be freely admitted that no new constitution can be worked without attempts at encroachment by all parties to it on one another till the boundary lines of privilege have been clearly settled. But there are several instances where the Assembly, to avert a collision, has assented to see its Bills amended in a way that was clearly opposed to public policy. I have pointed out that every Land Act sent up from the Assembly has combined its provisions for the public welfare with concessions to the land-owners and mortgagers, whom the Council peculiarly represents. The Council is also the last stronghold of religious intolerance. An Act for subsidizing Industrial Schools was transformed by the Council into an Act for establishing State Industrial Schools, and the country was committed to the principle of supporting all the children with whom various districts chose to saddle it, for fear Catholic schools should derive some advantage from the grants voted. The Assembly partially reversed this, but, as often happens when a bill is patched, with the result of retaining all that was objected to on either side: the establishment of pauper nurseries by the State, and

the endowment of denominational schools. The same difference between the two Houses was noticeable when the Bill for establishing a State system of education was discussed. The Council struck out the clause providing that secular instruction only should be given in State schools. It had been for the State against the sect, when the sect was unpopular; but it was in favour of general sectarianism against secularism. Happily the Assembly insisted on keeping the clause as it was first framed, and the Council decided not to risk a contest upon such a matter.

It is argued by those who defend the Council, that its power has often been wisely exercised. An instance not unfrequently given is where it rejected an Electoral Bill passed in 1873 by a large majority of the Assembly, and was afterwards applauded for its action by several who in the Assembly had voted for that measure. Again, it is said that the country has not been ripe for some measures which it refused to pass, such as the Abolition of State Aid, and has been generally indifferent to others, such as the Bill for Mining on Private Property. Whether these statements are correct or not, need scarcely be discussed. No one can doubt that a second Chamber is sometimes, and may be often, in the right, where the popular Assembly is precipitate and wrong-headed; neither, I think, can any one doubt that our sovereigns, if they resumed the old right of veto, might sometimes do good service to the State by rejecting a foolish bill that had received the assent of both Houses. But the same reasons that have led in England to the practical abolition of the sovereign's veto, and to the transformation of the Lords' veto into a suspensory negative, "not at all" into "not at once," seem conclusive against the power which the Council at present claims and habitually exercises.

In conclusion, it may be noted that the Council wavers at present, so far as the utterances of individual members can be trusted, between two opinions. The view that it represents property and the class specially interested in property, is modified by occasional admissions that it must give way to the clearly expressed will of the great majority. This partially simplifies the situation. The second Chamber may represent the minority when it is wrong, or misrepresent the majority, but so long as it does not claim to decide what is abstractedly just and right, it escapes the delusions that have misled sovereigns like Charles I. and George III. On the other hand, by this theory it renounces the claim to act as a check on Democracy, and tends to exasperate every popular movement. If, as the first theory implies, it represents a class distinct from the nation, the nation must either intimidate it or buy it over. If, as the second theory admits, it represents the nation, though less directly than the Assembly, the nation must emphasise its will when it wishes it to become law.

CHARLES H. PEARSON.

## THE EXPEDITION OF PHILIP II. TO ENGLAND.

BRIEF as was the connection of Philip II. of Spain with this country, his union with Mary Tudor having terminated with her death four years after their marriage, we cannot look back to that period of our history without feelings of more than ordinary interest, speculating perchance upon the fate of Western Europe had England been added to the wide dominions and the newly consolidated power of the Spanish monarchy. Strict as were the marriage articles in respect to Philip's own position in England, a son by Mary would, on the death of the ill-starred Infante Don Carlos, the issue of his first marriage, have inherited not only England but Spain, with all its vast dependencies. Public documents, the dispatches of envoys, as well as private memorials and letters, have supplied ample details of the single and married life of Mary Tudor. Her short and clouded reign is familiar to us, while her character, her mode of life, and her singularly unattractive countenance, depicted by Moro with evident fidelity, are probably as well known to us as those of any other contemporary sovereign. Some additional details of the expedition and of the arrival of Philip in England, of the marriage ceremonies, and more especially of the temper and demeanour of her subjects at this period, details which often rise but little above the level of gossip, yet interesting as coming from contemporary Spaniards, have lately been placed within our reach by the Sociedad de los Bibliófilos Españoles of Madrid.

The voyage of Philip to our shores, the subject of the volume published by this literary and antiquarian society for the year 1877, and edited by the competent hand of Don Pascual de Gayangos, comprises an account of the expedition by one Andres Muñoz, as well as four letters by three other persons. The first portion of the publication, the *Tratado* of Muñoz, who seems to have been an attendant of the Infante Don Carlos, was compiled in Spain from information supplied to the writer by various correspondents, and was printed, in the year 1554, in Zaragoza. Long forgotten, a copy probably unique was lately discovered, and has now been reprinted with explanatory notes, the more necessary as, according to Señor de Gayangos, the author was no *doctor en letras*, his style being incorrect and the narrative at times obscure.

The *Tratado*, or treatise, begins by describing the preparations for Philip's voyage to England, and the selection of the officials and domestics of the royal household, a numerous retinue, in accordance

with the ceremonial of the use of Burgundy, which had lately been adopted by the Spanish Court. Philip, in the provision made for those who were left behind, seems to have acted with a kindly consideration for his dependants not often attributed to him—at least by English writers. The mission of the Marques de las Navas, who was sent in advance with presents of jewels to Mary, all of which Muñoz describes and appraises minutely, follows; and we then encounter a formidable catalogue of the gala dresses of Philip and his retinue, involving so copious a use of superlatives in describing their magnificence, that our more sober language would scarcely lend itself to a literal translation of this part of the work. More interesting are the names of the mayor-domos and camareros, many of them the most conspicuous personages of the time; and we may feel an interest in the seven “salaried theologians,” who were to constitute a council of conscience, and ultimately to aid in the restoration of England to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

After the enumeration of all these persons, a curious account is given of the entertainments provided by the Conde de Benavente in his town and castle of Benavente, on the river Esla, in Leon, for the Infante Don Carlos, then a boy nine years of age, who was there to meet and take leave of his father. The number and splendour of the apartments prepared for them are recorded in much the same style as the catalogue of dresses already alluded to, sumptuous banquets and an army of servants, all minutely described, attesting the magnificence and hospitality of the Conde. Hunting during the day and fireworks at night seem to have occupied the time of the Infante, and on one occasion we find him amusing himself by fishing in the Conde’s garden, in a pond or tank, which is strangely described as being of the length of a horse’s charge; the fish were abundant and large, and so well pleased was the child with his sport and with the garden that he begged the Conde to accept the towns of Toro, Zamora, Aranda, and Simancas, a gift which was accepted with fitting gravity. Here, after a while, Philip joined his son, spending a few days with him, hunting and other diversions filling up their leisure time. During his stay a grand entertainment after the fashion of the time was prepared by the Conde. Movable castles, an elephant constructed out of a live horse and other materials, griffins, and a galley were paraded before the company. The hospitable ingenuity of the Conde must have been well-nigh exhausted, when he introduced a damsel stretched upon a bier making her plaint of the God of Love, who followed blindfold upon a horse; on reaching an appointed spot he was suddenly hitched off by a cunningly arranged rope, discharging innumerable rockets as he swung aloft, an incident which is recorded as having given great pleasure to all. Indeed, pyrotechny seems to have played



a very prominent part, and to have concluded the display of almost every device which was introduced.

Philip leaving for Coruña, where he was to embark, the Infante grieved much at his departure, but the Conde, ever mindful of the gentle duties of hospitality, provided a solace in the shape of an untamed cow, to which a quantity of fireworks were attached; these continued to explode for the space of half an hour. Here we might be tempted to descant upon the barbarism of a people who could, as the candour of Muñoz assures us, take pleasure in such a spectacle, but that unfortunately a recent historian reminds us that in 1730 the public of London was entertained by "a mad bull dressed with fireworks, and turned loose in a game place" (Lecky). In the respectable town of Stamford a bull was annually hunted in the streets as recently as 1825, the inhabitants, in accordance with a time-honoured custom, providing themselves with instruments locally known as bull-clubs for his benefit. Self-complacency may well shrink from this branch of historical research.

Strangely in contrast with all the bygone splendour of Benavente are the words of a modern writer, who declares that this ancient stronghold of the powerful family of Pimentel, lords of Benavente, is now an insignificant ruin, inferior to many of the Welsh castles. He adds that a considerable portion of the walls is built of cob, or concrete, the town dull and poverty-stricken. Soon afterwards the Infante departed for Valladolid, not without ample expressions of gratitude to his host. In the meantime his father was journeying to Santiago, where he met the English ambassadors, Bedford and Fitzwaters, the bearers of the marriage contract, to which, in spite of its restraints upon his power and position in England, he gave his assent, repugnant as such a concession must have been to one brought up in the highest notions of kingly privilege. Burnet, in the *History of the Reformation*, says that these articles were "so drawn by Gardiner as to exclude the Spaniards from any share of the government, which he intended to hold in his own hands." He adds that "the Spaniards were resolved to have the marriage on any terms, reckoning that if Philip were once in England he could easily enlarge his authority."

Philip pushed on again, and upon the 27th of June reached Coruña, where great preparations had been made to welcome him, triumphal arches, royal arms, warlike effigies, and especially five nymphs, one of whom bore the following legend:—

"Ni basta fuerza ni maña  
Contra el príncipe de España."

"Neither force nor guile can prevail against the Prince of Spain."

Heracles, who is described as King of Spain, 1668 B.C., was also

depicted, as indeed were many other wonderful things. Philip, having now reached the fleet which was to escort him to England, was received with much naval display. Immediately after his arrival the ship which had borne the Marques de las Navas to England came in with the tidings of the landing of the envoy, and of the preparations for the marriage at Winchester, which town Muñoz believed to be a seaport.

One hundred and fifty ships were now awaiting the Prince's orders; everything was prepared, and a vast quantity of money, which was to make things pleasant in England, had been shipped. Already, according to Strype, "good store of Spanish gold had come over, and as the value of the Portugal pieces was doubtful, a proclamation was issued, May 4 (1554), to fix it."

That the supply was kept up we learn from Burnet, who says that in October, 1554, twenty cart-loads of bullion, and ninety-nine horse and two cart-loads of coin were sent." This treasure arrived after the marriage, as Philip had "empowered his ambassadors and Gardiner to promise great sums to such as should promote his marriage." He was far too wary to adventure so great an amount of gold among the English people until their part of the bargain was completed. This profusion contrasts strongly with the want of money which constantly embarrassed the Emperor Charles V., causing disaffection and mutiny amongst his troops at the crisis of many great enterprises. Two years later also, owing either to Philip's poverty or neglect, the Emperor, when waiting at Jarandilla on his way to Yuste, was unable to discharge some of his servants for want of the first moiety of the pension for which he had stipulated on his abdication.

The last acts of Philip before embarking were marked by lavish bounty, "thus imitating," says Muñoz, "that most excellent and powerful grandee, Alexander of Macedon, of whose royal liberality such wonderful stories are told . . . and that glorious and illustrious doctor San Gregorio. . . . This saint having nothing left but a gold cup, bestowed it upon a poor man who sought alms of him." At last the day of departure came, the troops, the retinue, and the baggage were all on board, the weather was fine, and the wind fair, and on the 12th July, 1554, Philip left the shore in a state barge, and embarked in the ship of Martin de Bretendona. The grandees who had escorted him on board then took leave, and sought their respective vessels, all of which had been fitted out and decorated with especial magnificence; indeed, we are informed by Muñoz, "that even the sails were of an ornamental description, being painted with scenes from the life of Julius Cæsar, and other Roman emperors." Had it become necessary to take in a couple of reefs, the effect of these works of art would have been remarkable. The fleet did not

weigh until three P.M. on the following day, Friday, July 13, when each ship firing two guns, they put to sea. The style of Muñoz now rises to enthusiasm as he describes the salutes and the music, and how the southerly wind and the swelling sails soon bore them out of sight amidst the acclamations of the multitudes on shore. When they got out to sea, he says, "the fleet sailing in close order, with the bands playing, seemed like one of the fairest and strongest cities in the world." Don Fernando Enriquez, the hereditary Admiral of Castille, held the nominal command of the main body of the fleet; in all, however, that related to the sea, the real command was intrusted to Don Alvaro de Bazan, father of that Marques de Santa Cruz who, thirty-four years later, commanded the Invincible Armada, dying, however, before it quitted the ports of Spain.

Muñoz tells us "that in four days and fourteen hours the fleet anchored in the port of Antona" (Southampton). As they left Coruña at three P.M. on Friday, July 13, and anchored early in the afternoon of Thursday, July 19, our author is a little at fault in his calculation. The actual time was six days, and the distance made good about five hundred and twenty miles. Taking into consideration the calms they fell in with in the Channel, the nature of the ships of the period, and the necessity of sailing in squadron—itsself a cause of delay—for, as says that excellent seaman, Sir Richard Hawkins, in his *Observations*, "commonly one ship though a bad sayler maketh more haste than a whole fleet"—considering all this, the average work of about ninety miles a day may be looked upon as sufficiently creditable, even when compared with the performance of modern sailing vessels. According to Holinshed, Lord William Howard, the English admiral, met the Spanish fleet outside the Needles on Thursday, July 19. Muñoz, however, says that on entering Southampton water the Prince was saluted by thirty ships, English and Flemish, which there awaited his arrival. He slept on board that night, landing the next day in the barge of the English admiral. As he stepped on shore English Court officials delivered to him the insignia of the Garter, placing a gold chain upon his neck, and the garter round his knee. A palace had been prepared for him in Southampton, which is described as a town of three hundred houses.

On the afternoon of the following Monday, the fourth day after his landing, he set out in heavy rain for Winchester, accompanied by a numerous retinue. Arriving within a mile of that town, he alighted at the Abbey of St. Cross, in order to dress himself for his public entry. Sallying forth again clad in a cloak of black velvet, and in breeches and doublet of white velvet, he was received with much ceremony at Winchester, the keys of which town were offered to him. He proceeded at once to the cathedral, where, "advancing into the interior of the cathedral, accompanied by the

principal personages of the realm, by the grandees of Castille, and by many English knights and gentlemen, he went in procession to the high altar, where a curtained seat with a canopy of brocade was prepared for him. The service was chanted with as great solemnity as in the cathedral of Toledo."

According to Holinshed, Mary had travelled from Bishop's Waltham to Winchester on the preceding Saturday, July 21. Her ladies travelled from Windsor in a waggon painted red, and covered with fine red cloth, the harness all of red leather. This vehicle, as Miss Strickland, quoting the order for its construction, says, must have surpassed the splendour of a modern wild-beast show. At ten o'clock on the night of his arrival in Winchester, Philip paid a private visit to the Queen, so secret indeed as to escape the research of Holinshed, who says that his first visit was made on the following day. Private as it was, he was accompanied by some twenty grandees, among them Alva, Pescara, Feria, Hoorn, and Egmont, names to be heard of again in far different scenes in the time to come. Passing through the gardens of the episcopal palace, which had been prepared for the Queen's reception, the green lawns and flowing streams in all the glory of a midsummer night, suggesting to the Spaniards the scenes described in the books of chivalry, they reached a small door which led to the apartments where Mary, attended by Gardiner and some elderly magnates and ladies, awaited her hitherto unseen bridegroom. As he entered, she hurried forward to meet him, seizing him by the hand; he, however, putting all ceremony aside, kissed her, as, says Muñoz, is the custom here. They then conversed—he in Spanish, she in French—and we are told seemed to understand one another perfectly. Lord William Howard, the admiral, who is described as a man who would have his joke, said among his other pleasantries, "that well as they understood each other now, they would be far more intimate in four or five days."

After a while, Philip, who had had a long wet ride and a fatiguing day, manifested a wish to retire to his lodging (the Queen from some feeling of prudery not having allowed him rooms in the palace). Permission being granted after some little demur, he asked how he was to say "*buenas noches*" to the ladies of the Court: this salutation, according to Muñoz, is correctly rendered into English by the words "*God ni hit*," which were then and there taught him by the Queen. Forgetting his lesson before he reached the ladies, he was obliged to turn back when already in the middle of the hall to relearn it. This amused her Majesty very much, and so ended the evening of the first interview.

The next day, after dinner, Philip again visited the Queen, who received him in an apartment called the room of "*Poncia*," probably thus named after an early Bishop of Winchester,

John de Pontoise, who died A.D. 1304. Considering the treatment which English names meet with at the hands of the author, the resemblance in this case seems sufficiently close. This second visit being of a more ceremonious nature, the Queen issued from her chamber, preceded by her ladies and by two kings-at-arms; retiring with Philip to another room, they remained a long time together, the Spanish attendants endeavouring with no very great success to converse with the ladies of the Court. This evening, Figueroa, the Regent of Naples, arrived with the investiture of that kingdom, an appointment which was intended to place Philip on a footing of equality with the Queen of England. The following day, July 25, being the day of St. James, the patron saint of Spain, the marriage ceremony was performed with great pomp. Two swords of state were borne before their Majesties by personages whom Muñoz calls the Condes of Puenburque and Arbinque, but whom Señor de Gayangos converts into the Earls of Pembroke and Derby. We are told that the latter could muster twenty thousand soldiers; and that, as king of a certain island (Man), he was entitled to wear a crown of lead. So strange an assertion invited inquiry as to the nature of the crown of the sovereigns of the Isle of Man. The courtesy of Mr. Goldsmith, hon. secretary of the Manx Society, has supplied the required information. He refers to Blundell's *History of the Isle of Man*, written about 1650, and published in 1877.

The author, who was anxious to obtain information upon this very subject, says: "Neither of him (the governor) nor any other could I receive so much satisfaction as to be informed as to what fashion, or of what metal, the crown of the Kings of Man was made of. Out of the isle I conferred with some who would seem antiquaries, that confidently affirm that the crown was of iron; which was not altogether improbable, for it hath not been in use in England itself from the beginning to crown their kings with diadems of gold." Then he goes on to say: "The crown wherewith the King of Man was crowned was of pure gold." Muñoz must have been either the victim of a deliberate hoax, or he mistook iron for lead.

The ladies who assisted at the marriage ceremonial looked, we are told, "rather like celestial angels than ordinary mortals." The religious fervour of Mary, who kept her eyes fixed on the crucifix during the whole of the marriage service, was very conspicuous. A banquet followed, at which the Bishop of Winchester was the only other guest admitted to the royal table. Philip was served upon silver, Mary on silver gilt; a manifestation of precedence which was introduced in order to mark the difference of rank, Philip not having yet been crowned King of Naples. The numerous guests were accommodated at other tables, according to their official position or rank, and a magnificent banquet was served with much

stately ceremony. Between the banquet and the ball which followed it, the Spanish gentlemen endeavoured to converse with the English ladies, an attempt which was, however, frustrated by mutual ignorance of each other's language. The Spaniards, we are told, determined that they would give no presents—the phrase, which is not exactly in conformity with modern Spanish, is “*dar guantes*,” to give gloves—until they were able to understand them. Those few gentlemen who could speak English are said to have approved of an arrangement which left them in possession of the field. The ball lasted three hours, the King and Queen taking part in it, and dancing the *Alemana*, an ancient Spanish dance, very gracefully, the English ladies being much pleased with Philip's performance. Strype, however, says that upon this occasion “the Spaniards were greatly out of countenance for their dancing, especially King Philip dancing with the Queen, when they saw the Lord Bray and Mr. Carow, and others, far exceed them.”

After supper, which was a repetition of the banquet, the King was escorted by the grandees to the apartment of the Queen. The days which followed were spent in ceremonious festivities, and at this point it is well to remark that the narrative of Muñoz is wanting in much of the detail supplied by historians; and that, if closely scrutinised, it will be found occasionally deficient in accuracy. On the other hand, he records curious incidents not found elsewhere, but which bear the stamp of truthfulness.

He makes it a subject of complaint that none of the attendants brought by Philip were allowed to serve him, the Queen having provided him with a complete household according to the use of Burgundy. These officials were determined not to bate a jot of their privileges or their duties, and even the guard which Philip brought with him from Spain was relieved of its functions, for the English, jealous of the presence of so many Spaniards, were determined not to allow them any footing in the country. The idle life which all these Spaniards led, says the author, was very disadvantageous to them; some indeed, harping upon their books of chivalry, soon to be solemnly condemned by the *Córtes* at Valladolid, and somewhat later to incur the more potent ridicule of Cervantes, declared that they would “rather be in the stubble fields of Toledo than in these gardens of Amadis.”

A few days after the wedding their Majesties travelled towards London, the household coming in detachments, by reason of the want of sufficient accommodation upon the road. Here the narrative of Muñoz, of which but a very slight sketch is given, ends; but he devotes a few more sentences to a description of England, with the names of certain seaports on the south coast. Hopeless confusion results from his wild treatment of names. Cabodoble, which Señor de Gayangos accepts as the Cape of Dover, and Antona, South-

ampton, are almost the only ones which can be recognised. As to such names as Asalania and Artania, the Island of Lucia, the Sorlingas, and others, even conjecture is out of the question.

This country, he says, was the scene of the fables of King Lisuarte and the Round Table, of Merlin and his prophecies. It was originally peopled by giants, but after the destruction of Troy, a certain captain, named Bruto, who came from that city, vanquished and expelled them. From this name of Bruto, he adds, came the word Britain. The country is rich and fertile, "and from it have sprung heroes of wisdom and understanding, devoted to and maintaining the faith of Jesus Christ; burning and slaying with the edge of the sword the enemies of the holy Catholic faith, and, by the light of their good works and doctrine, preaching the evangelical law of Christianity, as did the Venerable Bede, and many others, his disciples, in England." He expresses a hope that, "in times to come, the subjects of the sovereign may imitate their predecessors, emulating their deeds, and by their example advancing the Christian faith." Some commonplace *villancicos*, or stanzas, in honour of the sovereigns, and redolent of flattery and fanaticism, conclude the work.

The Tratado of Muñoz is followed by four letters. The first of these, undated and without address, was written from Winchester during Philip's sojourn there to some one in Seville, and was printed in that city in 1554. The second, written from Richmond by a different hand, to a gentleman in Salamanca, completes the history of the expedition up to August 19, 1554; it belongs to a correspondence, the anterior part of which is missing. Another letter by the same writer, being the third of the present collection, was written from London Oct. 2, 1554. These two latter exist in MS. in the Escorial. The fourth and last letter, which was printed originally in Seville, and of which a copy is known to exist in the library of the Real Academia de la Historia, is addressed to the Condesa de Olivares, and, although undated, seems to have been written from London towards the end of 1554. Like the second and third, it is a fragment of a correspondence. It treats chiefly of the reception and conduct of Cardinal Pole. These four letters, says Señor de Gayangos, may be read as the complement of the narrative of Muñoz, throwing some light upon difficulties which have been the despair of the editor, especially in the matter of English names. He instances Aron, Arandera, Rondela, as attempts to designate the Earl of Arundel; Arbin and Aruin for the Earl of Derby; Atingush, Roselo, and Pajete, for Hastings, Russell, and Paget. The strangest perversion of all, however, occurs in the outlandish name Previselo, in which his ingenuity has discovered the Lord Privy Seal.

The first letter commences with the embarkation of Philip at Coruña, adding little of importance to the narrative of Muñoz, except

that on the night of the departure and during a portion of the following day there was a fresh wind and some sea, a serious matter to Philip, who was but an indifferent sailor. The English ambassadors, Bedford and Fitzwaters, who had met him at Santiago, seem to have been aware of this. Writing, in June, to the Council, they add in a postscript, "The Prince is wont to be very sick upon the sea, and these seas that he shall pass over into England are much worse than the Levant where he hath been heretofore. Wherefore, doubtless, lest he and his nobility will be desirous to land at the next land they can come to in England (as all men in their cases will covet and desire the same), your lordships shall do very well to take order that some preparation be made at Plymouth, and so along the sea-coast for him, if peradventure he shall land. Nevertheless," they bravely add, "we will do all that layeth in us to bring him to Southampton." It is unnecessary to extract from these letters that which has been already related by Muñoz respecting the sojourn at Southampton, the journey to Winchester, and the subsequent marriage. Describing the wedding banquet, the writer tells us that the table service was performed by Englishmen, except that Don Inigo de Mendoza, son of the Duke of Infantado, acted as cup-bearer to Philip. "Indeed," says he, "no one has so much as dreamt of performing any duty, or of bearing his staff of office. . . . We might all well be banished as idle vagabonds." The ladies of the household do not meet with his approval. "They are tall, their waists are tightly girdled. As far as dress goes they look well. Their toilettes are after the French fashion; they would look much better if they followed the fashion of the young Spanish ladies. Very few are good-looking, but some," he naïvely adds, "are better than others." They spend their time in the ante-chamber, dancing and conversing with those who visited them.

Friday, July 27, Fray Bartolomé de Miranda, in aftertimes Archbishop of Toledo, said mass in the cathedral, an act which surprised and grieved some as much as it pleased others. The writer hopes that the goodness of the Queen and her unceasing prayers may restore the country to Christianity and obedience to the Catholic Church.

Great rogues, he says, infest the highways; among other persons they had robbed the son of the Marques de Villena of four hundred crowns and all his plate; worse than this, however, four or five of Philip's own coffers were missing, in spite of the efforts of the Council to recover them. "It is well to be within doors before dark here; indeed, it is the usual practice."

Three days after the wedding the Duchess of Alva, accompanied, as became a great lady of Spain, by many of the *grandees* and *caballeros*, "wearing a gown of black velvet with lace, and embroidered with black silk cord," came to visit the Queen. As the



wife of the mayor-domo mayor, and as a former hostess of Philip, who, on his first marriage in 1542, had brought his bride the Infanta of Portugal to the Alva palace in Salamanca, Mary received her with marked distinction, while the Duchess on her part strove to render all homage to the Queen. "She was standing, and on the Duchess appearing she went from her dais almost to the door, where the Duchess, kneeling, besought her to give her her hand; the Queen, stooping down almost as low as the Duchess, embraced her without giving her hand. Rising up, she kissed her mouth, as is the custom here with queens when receiving princesses of the blood royal only. Taking the Duchess by the hand, she asked her how she had fared, and how she had borne the sea voyage, adding that she was delighted to see her. She then led her to the dais where there was a high chair; seating herself on the carpet she requested the Duchess to take the chair. This she declined to do, beseeching the Queen to take it.

"Two footstools, covered with brocade, were then brought in; the Queen seated herself on the one nearest to the chair, bidding the Duchess to take the other. She made a low reverence, and sat down on the ground at the Queen's side, as is the English custom. Upon this the Queen left the footstool, and sat by her on the carpet, refusing to rise.

"The Duchess persisting in her refusal, the Queen returned to the stool, ordering her to take the other, upon which the Duchess then seated herself." And so this curious scene was brought to a close.

They then conversed together for a long time, the Marques de las Navas acting as interpreter, for though the Queen understood Spanish she could not speak it. She managed, however, to say that it was hot, and other similar trifles. Being called away to receive certain ambassadors, she offered the use of her private apartment to the Duchess, who, however, begged to remain with the ladies of the household. Presently she returned, and after a little more conversation the Duchess departed to her lodging, which was at some distance, and to which she had to proceed, as the writer is particular in stating, on foot.

On Sunday, July 29, Philip and Mary dined in public, the Bishop of Winchester, the Marquis of Winchester, Lord Treasurer, with the Earls of Pembroke and Derby, forming the party at the royal table. The writer states, incidentally, that the incomes of the two latter did not exceed one thousand five hundred ducats. On the 31st the newly married couple, attended by a small retinue, took their departure, stopping the first night at the Basing House, a seat of the Marquis of Winchester.

The first letter ends here, and we proceed to the second, whose writer is more critical and piquant. He addresses a gentleman in

Salamanca. He informs his correspondent that their Majesties are "los mas bien casados del mundo"—the best-matched pair in the world—"and more enamoured of each other than I can well describe. His Highness never leaves the Queen; on our journeys he is always at her side, he assists her to mount and dismount. At certain times he dines with her in public, and they attend mass together on feast-days." In a promiscuous manner he describes the Queen as ugly, small, lean, pink and white complexion, no eyebrows, very pious, and very badly dressed. The writer was evidently no courtly chronicler, and his remarkable frankness tends to enhance the value of his narrative. The English ladies fail to please him. "All the women here wear under-petticoats of coloured cloth, no silk. Their gowns are of damask or coloured satin or velvet very badly made. Some wear shoes of velvet, but more commonly of leather. They wear black stockings, they show their legs sometimes even as far as the knee, at least when journeying, for their under-petticoats are short. When walking, and even when seated, they look *deshonestas*"—a word which may as well be left in the original. "They are not good-looking, and are not graceful when dancing; their dancing consists of constrained gestures and a shuffling gait. There is not a single Spanish gentleman who would give a farthing for any of them, and they care equally little for the Spaniards."

Time seems to have effected some improvement in this respect, as Jane Dormer, one of Mary's ladies, married Feriá, one of Philip's companions, who as Duque de Feriá was afterwards ambassador to England.

All the "fiestas" in this country, continues the writer, consist in eating and drinking, "for they understand no other mode of enjoying themselves." "The Queen's table costs annually more than three hundred thousand ducats." All the household and very many official persons lived in the palace, each señor having his own cook in the Queen's kitchen. "There are eighteen kitchens, and so great is the amount of work going on in each that it is in truth like an Inferno." The royal palaces are very large, and of the four which the writer had seen, the least was larger than the palace at Madrid. This comparison does not, of course, apply to the present magnificent building, but to the ancient Moorish Alcázar which formerly occupied the same site. "From eighty to one hundred sheep and about a dozen oxen, all very large and fat, are daily consumed in the palace. Also about eighteen calves, besides poultry, game, venison and wild boar, and a vast quantity of rabbits." (Compare 1 Kings iv. 23.) "Beer is so abundant that the summer flow of the river of Valladolid is not greater than the quantity used daily." He complains that, large as the palace (Richmond) is, the Duke and Duchess of Alba were not provided with apartments, and so shurlish were the people that with difficulty they found a house at all, and that none of the

best, in a neighbouring village. "Not only are they deprived of their official functions, but they are badly lodged besides." "The English," he continues, "hate us as they do the devil, and in that spirit they treat us. They cheat us in the town, and any one venturing to walk in the country is robbed. . . . Although the Council is quite aware of all this, it is tolerated. . . . In short, justice neither exists nor is administered, and there is no fear of God in the land." "They celebrate mass but seldom; few and unwilling are the hearers, although, wherever the Queen is, the services of the Church are fully observed, for she is saintly and Godfearing. As for ourselves, we can get no justice. His Majesty has enjoined us to dispute with no man, but rather while we are here to feign compliance and to submit in silence to all the ills we may have to encounter. The result is that they both treat us badly and despise us."

At this point he digresses to the capture of Rentz by the French, the news of which disaster caused a great commotion in Philip's suite, many of whom, both Spaniards and Flemings, obtained his permission to join the Emperor with all haste. "It would be well that they should not return here considering how they have been treated." Coming back to English affairs, he is of opinion that the sovereign does not rule, all real power being assumed by the Council, "some of whom have made their fortunes and secured their position by means of the revenues which they have taken from the churches. . . . Others were born to high position; these are feared and worshipped even more than the sovereign." "They"—*i.e.* the Council—"have announced publicly that his Highness must not leave the kingdom without their permission and that of the Queen, for that this kingdom by itself is a sufficient charge for any one King. . . . Considering what these English are, I am not surprised at this, because they have discovered the straits to which we are put in Flanders, rejoicing at them, and even wishing that they were worse. . . . They are in truth more for France than for Spain."

Reverting to a former grievance, he complains that no lodging is provided for the Spaniards, and that, living in the inns, they are charged exorbitantly. "As for the friars whom his Highness brought with him, they had better not have come, for as the English are malignant and ungodly, they so maltreat them that they dare not venture forth from their lodging." The mob endeavoured to tear off the robes of Don Pedro de Córdova and of Don Antonio, his nephew, both commanders of a military order, asking them why they wore crosses, and scoffing at them.

"Doña Hierónima de Navarra and Doña Francisca de Córdova, who came here, have not yet seen the Queen, and indeed will not see her. They have not been to Court, as they would have no one to speak to, the ladies here being very unsociable." The Duchess of Alva, he believes, will not be persuaded to go a second time. He

thinks the Queen is soon going to move to another palace, called Anton Curti (Hampton Court), which is one of the largest and most beautiful of the royal residences. The palaces are all decorated with abundance of tapestry, the spoils of churches and monasteries. The Crown, he says, has appropriated Church property to an amount double that of its own proper revenue. A year later, however, the Queen, as is well known, attempted to surrender first-fruits and tenths to the Pope. The Legislature, deeply implicated in the plunder of Church property, rejected the bill, and restitution was limited to the transfer of the Crown impropriations to the hands of Cardinal Pole. The letter concludes with the following passage:—"The authors of *Amadis de Gaul* and of other similar books of chivalry depicting flowery meads and enchanted castles, ought to have seen the strange habits and customs of this country. Who in any other place ever saw women riding unattended, and managing their horses with all the ease of a skilful man? The houses built for pleasure, the hills, woods, and forests, the delightful meadows, the fair and strong castles, the refreshing springs so abundant in this country, are all very pleasant here in the summer season." The letter ends with the date of August 16, 1554.

The third letter of the series, which is short and unimportant, is by the same hand as the preceding one, and is written from London, October 2, 1554. It begins by announcing that the country had proved unhealthy to the Spaniards, and that some of the servants had died. Thanks to God, however, "ninguno"—no one—had been in danger. This strange expression seems to mean that none of the more important personages had suffered. The country itself, he says, is good enough, but the natives, "considering that they call themselves Christians, are about the vilest upon earth." There are daily cases of stabbing, and in the previous week three Englishmen and one Spaniard were hung for crimes of violence.

The Queen's household is large, and comprises many of the principal personages of the realm. There are many ladies belonging to the Court, all positively ugly. "I cannot understand why this should be," he says (surely not very difficult to guess), "for outside the palace I have seen some good looks and pretty faces."

"All the women wear their dresses very short, and most of them wear black stockings, neat and well-fitting. They wear their shoes slashed, as do the men. . . . We Spaniards are about as much at our ease with these English as we should be with so many brute beasts; we neither understand them, nor they us, they are such barbarians."

He alludes to the Queen's expectation of an heir, and says that the matter is much spoken of in the palace. These rumours did not, however, become serious until late in the following spring, when a *Te Deum* was actually sung in Norwich Cathedral for the birth of a

son, and public rejoicings in London, and salutes from the shipping at Antwerp, welcomed the prince who, after all, was not to be.

Well might Philip be made to say—

. . . . . "I am sicker staying here  
Than any sea could make me passing hence,  
Tho' I be ever deadly sick at sea,  
So sick am I with biding for this child.  
Is it the fashion in this clime for women  
To go twelve months in bearing of a child?  
The nurses yawned, the cradle gaped, they led  
Processions, chanted litanies, clashed their bells,  
Shot off their lying cannon, and her priests  
Have preached, the fools of this fair prince to come,  
Till by St. James I find myself the fool."<sup>1</sup>

The writer again complains of the thieves, who are, however, severely punished when caught. Indeed, he says that one day an Englishman was hanged for stealing fourteen-pence; he makes a calculation, and finds that the amount is only eighty-four maravedis. Yet all this severity was of no avail. The next grievance is that everything, more especially provisions, is so dear; the Spanish gentlemen find that they have to disburse by the hundred where they had hoped to make ten suffice. With a promise to keep his correspondent informed of what may happen, this short letter ends.

The fourth letter, which is entitled "News from England," is addressed to the Condesa de Olivares, and professes to give an account of the restoration of England to the Catholic faith and to obedience to the Pope. It commences in the form of historical narrative, and relates how, as soon as Mary had succeeded to the throne, the Pope dispatched Cardinal Pole as legate to England. On reaching the Emperor's Court, and on hearing there of the turbulent disposition of the English, and of their unwillingness to render obedience to the Pope, he gave out that he had come to Flanders in order to await a peace between the Emperor and the King of France, abandoning for a time his journey to England. Upon this it was proposed in the Consistory to revoke his powers, as it seemed impossible to restore England to obedience. Philip, however, induced the Pope to support Pole, and shortly after the Council was persuaded to invite him over to England. The Parliament which assembled in November asked permission of the sovereigns to discuss the question of his reception, "for in this *Córtes* nothing can be discussed without permission of the Crown." This is the writer's version of what occurred, not entirely to be depended upon as regards strict historical accuracy.

Two Englishmen of distinction, whom the writer calls Mirol Pajete and Mirol Atingush—Lord Paget and Sir Edward Hastings—had already been dispatched to escort the Cardinal, who arrived

(1) Tennyson, *Queen Mary*, act iii. scene 4.

on the 24th November, disembarking at the river stairs of the palace of Whitehall. Philip, who was at dinner, rose from table at once, and hastened to welcome him, Mary remaining in the palace, and waiting to receive him on the principal staircase. As he approached she made a solemn reverence to the crucifix which he bore. After a brief interview he departed for Lambeth, which had been assigned to him as his lodging, its rightful occupant, Cranmer, who is described as "casado y gran hereje,"—married, and a great heretic,—being then a prisoner. The next two or three days were spent in the frequent interchange of visits between Pole and the sovereigns, preliminary to negotiations with the Parliament. On the 29th November the debate was commenced in the House of Lords by the ecclesiastics, who were grievously taunted by the lay peers for having consented to the divorce of Katherine of Aragon. After a while, however, they came to an agreement, revoking all the statutes of Henry VIII. and his son, which had encouraged disobedience to the Pope and belief in the "maldita y detestable" heresy of Luther. The next day, the festival of St. Andrew—which was ordered to be observed henceforth as the Feast of the Reconciliation, in memory of what occurred—a formal petition was presented by the Parliament to their Majesties, praying them, through the mediation of the Cardinal, to procure absolution and pardon from the Pope. This document enjoys the honour of having been done into verse by the Laureate (*Queen Mary*, act iii. sc. 3). Seldom, surely, has such unpromising material undergone a similar process. The original is given in many historical works, and so graphic and picturesque an account of the arrival and reception of Pole is to be found in the pages of Mr. Froude, that it seems a waste of time to follow any farther the meagre narrative of the Spanish writer.

He becomes more worthy of attention when, in concluding his letter, he describes a "juego de cañas," or tilting with reeds, which the Spaniards had prepared for the entertainment of the Court. The performers, thirty of a side, were marshalled in troops of ten, each troop in a gorgeous and distinctive costume, and under the command of some grandee. Philip himself took a part, joining the company of Don Diego de Córdoba. After much ceremonious parading before the spectators, first by twos and then in a body, they went through the mock combat, fortunately, says the writer, without fall or any other disaster. The novelty of the performance rendered it especially gratifying to the spectators. In this letter, which concludes the work, there is little worthy of note, and nearly all that it treats of can be better read elsewhere. It is wanting in the curious gossip of its predecessors, and its comparative dulness is not atoned for by historical accuracy or merit.

Señor de Gayangos, in his prefatory notes, remarks that Muñoz and the other writers observe a discreet silence as to the private life

and character of Philip ; their writings being of a semi-official nature, and some of them destined for the press, they would hardly venture to criticise or disparage so exalted a personage. Of their exceeding candour, when they *did* dare to speak freely, we have a specimen in the description of Mary, and in their comments upon the English ladies. We learn, he says, from correspondence of a more private nature (references not confided to the reader) that the conduct of Philip while in England was by no means exemplary, but, on the contrary, "dissolute and licentious in the extreme." He then alludes to the scandal as to his relations with Isabel de Osorio. This latter affair appears prominently in an important historical document, the Vindication of William of Orange, addressed, in 1580, to the Confederate States of Holland, and afterwards circulated among the Courts of Europe. After condemning the despotic temper of Philip, his tyranny in the Low Countries, and the cruelties sanctioned by him in Granada, Mexico, and Peru, he turns to his family affairs and accuses him of the murder of his third wife, Elizabeth de Valois—the beautiful Isabel de la Paz of the Spaniards. He declares, also, that at the time of Philip's first marriage with the Princess of Portugal, he was actually married to Isabel de Osorio, by whom he had two sons, Pedro and Bernardino. If this latter accusation be grounded on no better evidence than the former, he must so far be held innocent, for, in spite of the assertions of the Prince of Orange, modern historians have satisfied themselves that Elizabeth died a natural death, if indeed in that age any death could be termed natural where the patient was abandoned to the care of Spanish physicians.

Here we take leave of the book and its hero. The short episode in Philip's life, when for a while he sacrificed himself to Mary Tudor and to political expediency, is soon about to close, and that England, which never loved him too well, will know him no more except as her bitterest foe. A long life chequered with light and shadow, with great victories and as great calamities, is before him. St. Quentin, Gravelines, and Lepanto are in the future, to be more than balanced by the loss of the Netherlands and the destruction of the Invincible Armada, the crowning disaster bringing desolation to well-nigh every family of Spain. Yet farther in the more distant future stands the grim shadow of the Escorial, and the narrow death-bed cell hard by the high altar of the central sanctuary. Here, fixing his eyes upon the cross, which through life he had thought to reverence by a career of bloodshed and deceit, he passed away, hated and feared of men.

And now, in the dimly lighted vaults of the Pantheon beneath, surrounded by the ashes of his kindred, a marble tomb, the show of every passing traveller, holds all that remains of Philip, King of Spain.

DUCIE.

## THE HISTORY OF GAMES.

BEFORE examining some groups of the higher orders of games, with the view of tracing their course in the world, it will be well to test by a few examples the principles on which we may reason as to their origin and migrations. An intelligent traveller among the Kalmuks, noticing that they play a kind of chess resembling ours, would not for a moment entertain the idea of such an invention having been made more than once, but would feel satisfied that we and they and all chess-players must have had the game from one original source. In this example lies the gist of the ethnological argument from artificial games, that when any such appears in two districts it must have travelled from one to the other, or to both from a common centre. Of course this argument does not apply to all games. Some are so simple and natural that, for all we can tell, they may often have sprung up of themselves, such as tossing a ball or wrestling; while children everywhere imitate in play the serious work of grown-up life, from spearing an enemy down to moulding an earthen pot. The distinctly artificial sports we are concerned with here are marked by some peculiar trick or combination not so likely to have been hit upon twice. Not only complex games like chess and tennis, but even many childish sports, seem well-defined formations, of which the spread may be traced on the map much as the botanist traces his plants from their geographical centres. It may give us confidence in this way of looking at the subject if we put the opposite view to the test of history and geography to see where it fails. Travellers, observing the likeness of children's games in Europe and Asia, have sometimes explained it on this wise: that the human mind being alike everywhere, the same games are naturally found in different lands, children taking to hockey, tops, stilts, kites, and so on, each at its proper season. But if so, why is it that in outlying barbarous countries one hardly finds a game without finding also that there is a civilised nation within reach from whom it may have been learnt? And what is more, how is it that European children knew nothing till a few centuries ago of some of their now most popular sports? For instance, they had no battledore-and-shuttlecock and never flew kites till these games came across from Asia, when they took root at once and became naturalised over Europe. The origin of kite-flying seems to lie somewhere in South-east Asia, where it is a sport even of grown-up men, who fight their kites by making them cut one another's strings, and fly birds and monsters of the most fantastic



shapes and colours, especially in China, where old gentlemen may be seen taking their evening stroll, kite-string in hand, as though they were leading pet dogs. The English boy's kite appears thus an instance, not of spontaneous play-instinct, but of the migration of an artificial game from a distant centre. Nor is this all it proves in the history of civilisation. Within a century, Europeans becoming acquainted with the South Sea Islanders found them down to New Zealand adepts at flying kites, which they made of leaves or bark cloth, and called *mānu*, or "bird," flying them in solemn form with accompaniment of traditional chants. It looks as though the toy reached Polynesia through the Malay region, thus belonging to that drift of Asiatic culture which is evident in many other points of South Sea Island life. The geography of another of our childish diversions may be noticed as matching with this. Mr. Wallace relates that being one wet day in a Dayak house in Borneo, he thought to amuse the lads by taking a piece of string to show them *cat's-cradle*, but to his surprise he found that they knew more about it than he did, going off into figures that quite puzzled him. Other Polynesians are skilled in this nursery art, especially the Maoris of New Zealand, who call it *maui* from the name of their national hero, by whom, according to their tradition, it was invented; its various patterns represent canoes, houses, people, and even episodes in Maui's life, such as his fishing up New Zealand from the bottom of the sea. In fact, they have their pictorial history in *cat's-cradle*, and whatever their traditions may be worth, they stand good to show that the game was of the time of their forefathers, not lately picked up from the Europeans. In the Sandwich Islands and New Zealand it is on record that the natives were found playing a kind of draughts which was not the European game, and which can hardly be accounted for but as another result of the drift of Asiatic civilisation down into the Pacific.

Once started, a game may last on almost indefinitely. Among the children's sports of the present day are some which may be traced back toward the limits of historical antiquity, and, for all we know, may have been old then. Among the pictures of ancient Egyptian games in the tombs of Beni Hassan, one shows a player with his head down so that he cannot see what the others are doing with their clenched fists above his back. Here is obviously the game called in English *hot-cockles*, in French *main-chaude*, and better described by its mediæval name of *qui fery*? or "who struck?"—the blindman having to guess by whom he was hit, or with which hand. It was the Greek *kollabismos*, or buffet-game, and carries with it a tragical association in those passages in the Gospels which show it turned to mockery by the Roman soldiers: "And when they had blindfolded him . . . they buffeted him . . . saying, Prophecy

unto us, Christ, Who is he that smote thee?" (Luke xxii. 64; Matt. xxvi. 67; Mark xiv. 65.)

Another of the Egyptian pictures plainly represents the game we know by its Italian name of *morra*, the Latin *micatio*, or flashing of the fingers, which has thus lasted on in the Mediterranean districts over three thousand years, handed down through a hundred successive generations who did not improve it, for from the first it was perfect in its fitting into one little niche in human nature. It is the game of guessing addition, the players both at once throwing out fingers and in the same moment shouting their guesses at the total. *Morra* is the pastime of the drinking-shop in China as in Italy, and may, perhaps, be reckoned among the items of culture which the Chinese have borrowed from the Western barbarians. Though so ancient, *morra* has in it no touch of prehistoric rudeness, but must owe its origin to a period when arithmetic had risen quite above the savage level. The same is true of the other old arithmetical game, *odd-and-even*, which the poet couples with riding on a stick as the most childish of diversions, "*Iudere par impar, equitare in arundine longa.*" But the child playing it must be of a civilised nation, not of a low barbaric tribe, where no one would think of classing numbers into the odd-and-even series, so that Europeans have even had to furnish their languages with words for these ideas. I asked myself the question whether the ancient Aryans distinguished odd from even, and curiously enough found that an answer had been preserved by the unbroken tradition not of Greek arithmeticians, but of boys at play. A scholiast on the *Ploutos* of Aristophanes, where the game is mentioned, happens to remark that it was also known as ζυγά ἢ ἄζυγα, "*yokes or not-yokes.*" Now this matches so closely in form and sense with the Sanskrit terms for even and odd numbers, *yuj* and *ayuj*, as to be fair evidence that both Hindus and Greeks inherited arithmetical ideas and words familiar to their Aryan ancestors.

Following up the clues that join the play-life of the ancient and modern worlds, let us now look at the ball-play, which has always held its place among sports. Beyond mere tossing and catching, the simplest kind of ball-play is where a ring of players send the ball from hand to hand. This gentle pastime has its well-marked place in history. Thus the ancient Greeks, whose secret of life was to do even trivial things with artistic perfection, delighted in the game of *Nausikaa*, and on their vases is painted many a scene where ball-play, dance, and song unite in one graceful sport. The ball-dance is now scarcely to be found but as an out-of-the-way relic of old custom; yet it has left curious traces in European languages, where the *ball* (Low Latin *balla*) has given its name to the dance it went with (Italian *ballare*, *ballo*, French *bal*, English *ball*), and even to the song

that accompanied the dance (Italian *ballata*, French *ballade*, English *ballad*). The passion of ball-play begins not with this friendly graceful delivery of the ball into the next hand, but when two hostile players or parties are striving each to take or send it away from the other. Thus, on the one hand, there comes into existence the group of games represented by the Greek *harpaston*, or seizing-game, where the two sides struggled to carry off the ball. In Brittany this has been played till modern times with the hay-stuffed *soule* or *sun-ball*, as big as a football, fought for by two communes, each striving to carry it home over their own border. Émile Souvestre, in his *Derniers Bretons*, has told the last story of this fierce game in the Ponthivy district—how the man who had had his father killed and his own eye knocked out by François, surnamed le Souleur, lay in wait for that redoubted champion, and got him down, soule and all, half-way across the boundary stream. The murderous soule-play had to be put down by authority, as it had been years before in Scotland, where it had given rise to the suggestive proverb, "All is fair at the ball of Scone." The other class of hostile ball-games differs from this in the ball having not to be brought to one's own home, but sent to the goal of the other side. In the Greek *epikoinos*, or common-ball, the ball was put on the middle line, and each party tried to seize it and throw it over the adversary's goal-line. This game also lasted on into modern Europe, and our proper English name for it is *hurling*, while *football* also is a variety of it, the great Roman blown leather ball (*foliis*) being used instead of the small hand-ball, and kicked instead of thrown. Now as hurling was an ordinary classical game, the ancients need only have taken a stick to drive the ball instead of using hands or feet, and would thus have arrived at *hockey*. But Corydon never seems to have thought of borrowing Phillis's crook for the purpose it would have so exactly suited. No mention of games like hockey appears in the ancient world, and the course of invention which brought them into the modern world is at once unexpected and instructive.

The game known to us as *polo* has been traced by Sir W. Ouseley, in Persia, far back in the Sassanian dynasty, and was at any rate in vogue there before the eighth century. It was played with the long-handled mallet called *chugán*, which Persian word came to signify also the game played with it. This is the instrument referred to in the *Thousand and One Nights*, and among various earlier passages where it occurs is the legend told by the Persian historian of Darius insulting Alexander by sending him a ball and mallet (*guî ve chugán*) as a hint that he was a boy more fit to play polo than to go to war. When this tale finds its way to Scotland, in the romance of King Alisaunde, these unknown instruments are replaced by a whipping-top, and Shakspeare has the story in the English

guise of a newer period in the scene in Henry V.: "What treasure, uncle?"—"Tennis-balls, my liege." By the ninth century the game of *chugán* had established itself in the Eastern Empire, where its name appears in the barbarous Greek form *τζουκανίζειν*. In the Byzantine descriptions, however, we find not the original mallet, but a long staff ending in a broad bend filled in with a network of gut-strings. Thus there appear in the East, as belonging to the great sport of ball-play on horseback, the first shapes of two implements which remodelled the whole play-life of mediæval and modern Europe, the *chugán* being the ancestor of the mallets used in pall-mall and croquet, and of an endless variety of other playing clubs and bats, while the bent staff with its network was the primitive racket. The fine old Persian drawing of a match at *chugán*, which is copied by Ouseley in his *Travels in the East*, justifies his opinion that the horseback game is the original. We should not talk of polo as being "hockey on horseback," but rather regard hockey as dismounted polo, and class with it pall-mall, golf, and many another bat-and-ball game. Indeed, when one comes to think of it, one sees that no stick being necessary for the old foot game of hurling, none was used, but as soon as the Persian horsemen wanted to play ball on horseback, a proper instrument had to be invented. This came to be used in the foot game also, so that the Orientals are familiar both with the mounted and dismounted kinds. The horseback game seems hardly to have taken hold in Europe till our own day, when the English brought it down from Munniemoor, and it has now under the name of *polo* become a world-wide sport again. But the foot game made its way early into Europe, as appears from a curious passage in Joinville's *Life of St. Louis*, written at the end of the thirteenth century. Having seen the game on his crusade, and read about it in the Byzantine historians, he argues that the Greeks must have borrowed their *tzycanisterium* from the French, for it is, he says, a game played in Languedoc by driving a box-wood ball with a long mallet, and called there *chicane*. The modern reader has to turn this neat and patriotic argument upside down, the French *chicane* being only a corruption of the Persian *chugán*; so that what Joinville actually proves is, that before his time the Eastern game had travelled into France, bringing with it its Eastern name. Already, in his day, from the ball-game with its shifts and dodges, the term *chicane* had come to be applied by metaphor to the shuffles of lawyers to embarrass the other side, and thence to intrigue and trickery in general. English has borrowed *chicane* in the sense of trickery, without knowing it as the name of a game. Metaphors taken from sports may thus outlast their first sense, as when again people say, "Don't *bandy* words with me," without an idea that they are using another metaphor taken from the game of hockey,

which was called *bandy* from the curved stick or club it was played with.

In France, the name of *crosse*, meaning a crutch, or bishop's crosier, was used for the mallet, and thence the game of hockey has its ordinary French name, *jeu de la crosse*. In Spanish, the game has long been known as *chueca*. The Spaniards taught it to the natives of South America, who took kindly to it, not as mere boys' play, but as a manly sport. It is curious to read accounts by modern European travellers, who seem not to recognise their own playground game when transplanted among the Araucanians of Chili, even though it shows its Spanish origin by the name of *chueca*. Seeing this, one asks whence did the North American Indians get their famous ball-play, known from California right across the Indian country? It is to all intents the European *chueca*, *crosse*, or *hockey*, the deerskin ball being thrown up in the middle, each of the two contending parties striving to throw or drive it through the adversaries' goal. The Iroquois say that in old times their forefathers played with curved clubs and a wooden ball, before the racket was introduced, with which to strike, carry, or throw the leather ball. Of all the describers of this fine game, Catlin has best depicted its scenes with pen and pencil, from its beginning with the night ball-play dance, where the players crowded round their goals, held up and clashed their rackets, and the women danced in lines between, and the old men smoked to the Great Spirit and led the chant for his favour in the contest. The painter would never miss a ball-play, but sit from morning till sundown on his pony studying the forms of the young athletes in their "almost superhuman" struggles for the ball, till at last one side made the agreed number of goals, and divided with yells of triumph the fur robes and tin-kettles and miscellaneous property staked on the match. Now, as to the introduction of the game into North America, the Jesuit missionaries in New France as early as 1636 mention it by their own French name of *jeu de crosse*, at which Indian villages contended "*à qui crossera le mieux.*" The Spaniards, however, had been above a century in America, and might have brought it in, which is a readier explanation than the other possible alternative that it made its way across from South-east Asia.

When the Middle Ages set in, the Europe anmind at last became awake to the varied pleasure to be got out of hitting a ball with a bat. The games now developed need not be here spoken of at length proportioned to their great place in modern life, as the changes which gave rise to them are so comparatively modern and well known. The Persian apparatus kept close to its original form in the game of *pall-mall*, that is, "ball-mallet," into which game was introduced the arch or ring to drive the ball through, whereby enough incident was

given to knocking it about to make the sport fit for a few players, or even a single pair. An account of pall-mall and its modern revival in *croquet* will be found in Dr. Prior's little book. Playing the ball into holes serves much the same purpose as sending it through rings, and thus came in the particular kind of bandy called *golf*, from the clubs used to drive the ball. The *stool-ball*, so popular in mediæval merrymakings, was played with a stool, which one protected by striking away with his hands the ball which another bowled at it; the in-player was out if the stool was hit, or he might be caught out, so that here is evidently part of the origin of cricket, in which the present stumps seem to represent the stool. In *club-ball* a ball was bowled and hit with a club; and a game called *cat-and-dog* was played in Scotland two centuries ago, where players protected not wickets but holes from the wooden cat pitched at them, getting runs when they hit it. We have here the simple elements from which the complex modern cricket was developed. Lastly, among the obscure accounts of ancient ball-play, it is not easy to make out that the ball was ever sent against an opposite wall for the other player to take it at the bound and return it. Such a game, particularly suited to soldiers shut up in castle-yards, became popular about the fourteenth century under the name of *pila palmaria*, or *jeu de paulme*, which name indicates its original mode of striking with the palm of the hand, as in *fives*. It was an improvement to protect the hand with a glove, such as may still be seen in the ball-play of Basque cities, as at Bayonne. Sometimes a battledore faced with parchment was used, as witness the story of the man who declared he had played with a battledore that had on it fragments of the lost decades of Livy. But it was the racket that made possible the "cutting" and "boasting" of the mediæval tennis-court, with its elaborate scoring by "chases." No doubt it was the real courtyard of the château, with its penthouses, galleries, and grated windows, that furnished the tennis-court with the models for its quaintly artificial grilles and lunes so eruditely discussed in Mr. Julian Marshall's *Annals of Tennis*. A few enthusiastic amateurs still delight in the noble and costly game, but the many have reason to be grateful for lawn-tennis out of doors, though it be but a mild version of the great game, to which it stands as hockey to polo or as draughts to chess.

Turning now to the principal groups of sedentary games, I may refer to the evidence I have brought forward elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> that the use of lots or dice for gambling arose out of an earlier serious use of such instruments for magical divination. The two conceptions, indeed, pass into one another. The magician draws lots to learn the future and the gambler to decide the future, so that the difference between them is that between "will" and "shall." But the two-

(1) *Primitive Culture*, chap. iii.

faced lot that can only fall head or tail can only give a simple yes or no, which is often too simple for either the diviner or the gambler. So we find African negroes divining with a number of cowries thrown together to see how many fall up and how many down; and this, too, is the Chinese method of solemn lot-casting in the temple, when the falling of the spoon-like wooden lots, so many up and so many down, furnishes an intricate result which is to be interpreted by means of the book of mystic diagrams. When this combination of a number of two-faced lots is used by gamblers, this, perhaps, represents the earlier stage of gaming, which may have led up to the invention of dice, in which the purpose of variety is so much more neatly and easily attained. The first appearance of dice lies beyond the range of history, for though they have not been traced in the early periods in Egypt, there is in the Rig-Veda the hymn which portrays the ancient Aryan gambler stirred to frenzy by the fall of the dice. It is not clear even which came first of the various objects that have served as dice.

In the classic world, girls used the astragali or hucklebones as playthings, tossing them up and catching them on the back of the hand; and to this day we may see groups of girls in England at this ancient game, reminding us of the picture by Alexander of Athens, in the Naples Museum, of the five goddesses at play. It was also noticed that these bones fall in four ways, with the flat, concave, convex, or sinuous side up, so that they form natural dice, and as such they have been from ancient times gambled with accordingly. In India nature provides certain five-sided nuts that answer the purpose of dice. Of course, when the sides are alike, they must be marked or numbered, as with the four-sided stick-dice of India, and that which tends to supersede all others, the six-sided *kubos*, which gave the Greek geometers the name for the *cube*. Since the old Aryan period many a broken gamester has cursed the hazard of the die. We moderns are apt to look down with mere contempt at his folly. But we judge the ancient gamester too harshly if we forget that his passion is mixed with those thoughts of luck or fortune or superhuman intervention, which form the very mental atmosphere of the soothsayer and the oracle-prophet. With devout prayer and sacrifice he would propitiate the deity who should give him winning throws; nor, indeed, in our own day have such hopes and such appeals ceased among the uneducated. To the educated it is the mathematical theory of probabilities that has shown the folly of the gamester's staking his fortune on his powers of divination. But it must be borne in mind that this theory itself was, so to speak, shaken out of the dice-box. When the gambling Chevalier de Méré put the question to Pascal in how many throws he ought to get double-sixes, and Pascal solving the problem, started the mathematical calcula-

tion of chances, this laid the foundation of the scientific system of statistics which more and more regulates the arrangements of society. Thus accurate method was applied to the insurance table, which enables a man to hedge against his ugliest risks, to eliminate his chances of fire and death by betting that he shall have a new roof over his head and a provision for his widow. Of all the wonderful turns of the human mind in the course of culture, scarce any is more striking than this history of lots and dice. Who, in the Middle Ages, could have guessed what would be its next outcome—that magic sunk into sport should rise again as science, and man's failure to divine the future should lead him to success in controlling it?

Already in the ancient world there appear mentions of games where the throws of lots or dice, perhaps at first merely scored with counters on a board, give the excitement of chance to a game which is partly a draught-game, the player being allowed to judge with which pieces he will move his allotted number. In England this group of games is represented by *backgammon*. When Greek writers mention dice-playing, they no doubt often mean some game of this class, for at mere hazard the Persian queen-mother could not have played her game carefully, as Plutarch says she did, nor would there have been any sense in his remark that in life, as in dicing, one must not only get good throws, but know how to use them. The Roman game of the twelve lines (*duodecim scripta*) so nearly corresponded with our trietrac or backgammon, that M. Becq de Fouquières, in his *Joux des Anciens*, works out on the ordinary backgammon board the problem of the Emperor Zeno that has vexed the soul of many a critic. All these games, however, are played with dice, and as there exist other games of like principle where lots are thrown instead of dice, it may, perhaps, be inferred that such rudier and clumsier lot-backgammon was the earlier, and dice-backgammon a later improvement upon it. Of course things may have happened the opposite way. Lot-backgammon is still played in the East in more than one form. The Arabic-speaking peoples call it *tab*, or game, and play it with an oblong board or rows of holes in the ground, with bits of brick and stone for draughts of the two colours, and for lots four palm-stick slips with a black and white side. In this low variety of lot-backgammon, the object is not to get one's own men home, but to take all the adversary's. The best representative of this group of games is the Hindu *pachisi*, which belongs to a series ancient in India. It is played on a cross-shaped board or embroidered cloth, up and down the arms of which the pieces move and take, in somewhat the manner of backgammon, till they get back to the central home. The men move by the throws of a number of cowries, of which the better throws not only score high, but entitle the player to a new throw, which corresponds to our rule of doubles giving a



double move at backgammon. The game of pachisi has great vogue in Asia, extending into the far East, where it is played with flat tamarind-seeds as lots. It even appears to have found its way still farther eastward into America, forming a link in the chain of evidence of an Asiatic element in the civilisation of the Aztecs.<sup>1</sup> For the early Spanish-American writers describe, as played at the Court of Montezuma, a game called *patolli*, played after the manner of their European tables or backgammon, but on a mat with a diagram like a + or Greek cross, full of squares on which the different-coloured stones or pieces of the players were moved according to the throws of a number of marked beans. Without the board and pieces, the mere throwing hazards with the beans or lots, to bet on the winning throws, furnishes the North American tribes with their favourite means of gambling, the game of plumstones, game of the bowl, &c.

It is a curious inquiry what led people to the by no means obvious idea of finding sport in placing stones or pieces on a diagram and moving them by rule. One hint as to how this may have come about is found in the men at backgammon acting as though they were "counters" counting up the throws. The word *abax*, or *abacus*, is used both for the reckoning-board with its counters and the play-board with its pieces, whence a plausible guess has been made that playing on the ruled board came from a sportive use of the serious counting instrument. The other hint is that board-games, from the rudest up to chess, are so generally of the nature of *kriegspiel*, or war-game, the men marching on the field to unite their forces or capture their enemies, that this notion of mimic war may have been the very key to their invention. Still these guesses are far from sufficient, and the origin of board-games is still among the anthropologist's unanswered riddles. The simpler board-games of skill, that is, without lots or dice, and played by successive moves or draws of the pieces, may be classed accordingly as games of *draughts*, this term including a number of different games, ancient and modern.

The ancient Egyptians were eager draught-players; but though we have many pictures, and even the actual boards and men used, it is not clear exactly how any of their games were played. Ingenuity and good heavy erudition have been misspent by scholars in trying to reconstruct ancient games without the necessary data, and I shall not add here another guess as to the rules of the draughts with which Penelope's suitors delighted their souls as they sat at the palace gates on the hides of the oxen they had slaughtered; nor will I discuss the various theories as to what the "sacred line" was in the Greek game of the "five lines," mentioned by Sophokles. It will be more to the purpose to point out that games worth keeping up hardly die out, so that among existing sports are probably repre-

(1) See the author's paper in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, November, 1878

sented, with more or less variation, the best games of the ancients. On looking into the mentions of the famous Greek draught-game of *plinthion*, or *polis*, it appears that the numerous pieces, or "dogs," half of them of one colour and half of the other, were moved on the squares of the board, the game being for two of the same colour to get one of the other colour between them, and so take him. The attempt to reason out from this the exact rules of the classic game has not answered. But on looking, instead of arguing, I find that a game just fitting the description still actually exists. The donkey-boys of Cairo play it in the dust with "dogs," which are bits of stone and red brick, and the guides have scratched its *siqa*, or diagram, on the top of the great pyramid. If it was not there before, it would have come with Alexander to Alexandria, and has seemingly gone on unchanged since. There is an account of it in Lane's *Modern Egyptians*, and any one interested in games will find it worth trying with draughts on a cardboard square. One kind of the Roman game of *latrunculi* was closely related to this, as appears from such passages as Ovid's "cum medius gemino calculus hoste perit," referring to the stone being taken between two enemies. The poet mentions, a few lines farther on, the little table with its three stones, where the game is "continuasse suos," to get your men in a line, which is, of course, our own childish game of *tit-tat-to*. This case of the permanence of an ancient game was long ago recognised by Hyde in his treatise, *De Ludis Orientalibus*. It is the simplest form of the group known to us as *mill*, *merelles*, *morris*, played by children all the way across from Shetland to Singapore. Among the varieties of draught-games played in the world, one of the most elaborate is the Chinese *wei-chi*, or game of circumvention, the honoured pastime of the learned classes. Here one object is to take your enemy by surrounding him with four of your own men, so as to make what is called an "eye," which looks as though the game belonged historically to the same group as the simpler classic draughts, where the man is taken between two adversaries. In modern Europe the older games of this class have been superseded by one on a different principle. The history of what we now call *draughts* is disclosed by the French dictionary, which shows how the men used to be called *pions*, or pawns, till they reached the other side of the board, then becoming *dames*, or queens. Thus the modern game of draughts is recognised as being, in fact, a low variety of chess, in which the pieces are all pawns, turned into queens in chess-fashion when they gain the adversary's line. The earliest plain accounts of the game are in Spanish books of the Middle Ages, and the theory of its development through the mediæval chess problems will be found worked out by the best authority on chess, Dr. A. van der Linde, in his *Geschichte des Schachspiels*.

The group of games represented by the Hindu *tiger-and-cours*, our *fox-and-geese*, shows in a simple way the new situations that arise in board-games when the men are no longer all alike, but have different powers, or moves. Isidore of Seville (about A.D. 600) mentions, under the name of *latrunculi*, a game played with pieces of which some were common soldiers (*ordinarii*), marching step by step, while others were wanderers (*vagi*). It seems clear that the notions of a *kriegspiel*, or war-game, and of pieces with different powers moving on the chequer-board, were familiar in the civilised world at the time when, in the eighth century or earlier, some inventive Hindu may have given them a more perfect organization by setting on the board two whole opposing armies, each complete in the four forces, foot, horse, elephants, and chariots, from which an Indian army is called in Sanskrit *chaturanga*, or "four-bodied." The game thus devised was itself called *chaturanga*, for when it passed into Persia it carried with it its Indian name in the form *shatranj*, still retained there, though lost by other nations who received the game from Persia, and named it from the Persian name of the principal piece, the *shah*, or king, whence *schach*, *eschecs*, *chess*. According to this simple theory, which seems to have the best evidence, chess is a late and high development arising out of the ancient draught-games. But there is another theory maintained by Professor Duncan Forbes in his *History of Chess*, and prominent in one at least of our chess handbooks, which practically amounts to saying that chess is derived from backgammon. It is argued that the original game was the Indian fourfold-chess, played with four half-sets of men, black, red, green, and yellow, ranged on the four sides of the board, the moves of the pieces being regulated by the throws of dice; that in course of time the dice were given up, and each two allied half-sets of men coalesced into one whole set, one of the two kings sinking to the position of minister, or queen. Now this fourfold Indian dice-chess is undoubtedly a real game, but the mentions of it are modern, whereas history records the spread of chess proper over the East as early as the tenth century. In the most advanced Indian form of *pachisi*, called *chupur*, there are not only the four sets of different-coloured men, but the very same stick-dice that are used in the dice-chess, which looks as though this latter game, far from being the original form of chess, were an absurd modern hybrid resulting from the attempt to play backgammon with chess-men. This is Dr. van der Linde's opinion, readers of whose book will find it supported by more technical points, while they will be amused with the author's zeal in belabouring his adversary Forbes, which reminds one of the legends of mediæval chess-players, where the match naturally concludes by one banging the other about the head with the board. It is needless to describe here the well-known points of difference between the Indo-Persian and the modern

European chess. On the whole, the Indian game has substantially held its own, while numberless attempts to develop it into philosophers' chess, military tactics, &c., have been tried and failed, bringing, as they always do, too much instructive detail into the plan which in ancient India was shaped so judiciously between sport and science.

In this survey of games I have confined myself to such as offered subjects for definite remark, the many not touched on including cards, of which the precise history is still obscure. Of the conclusions brought forward, most are no doubt imperfect, and some may be wrong, but it seemed best to bring them forward for the purpose of giving the subject publicity, with a view to inducing travellers and others to draw up minutely accurate accounts of all undescribed games they notice. In Cook's *Third Voyage* it is mentioned that the Sandwich Islanders played a game like draughts with black and white pebbles on a board of 14 by 17 squares. Had the explorers spent an hour in learning it, we should perhaps have known whether it was the Chinese or the Malay game, or what it was; and this might have been the very clue, lost to native memory, to the connection of the Polynesians with a higher Asiatic culture in ages before a European ship had come within their coral reefs.

It remains to call attention to a point which this research into the development of games brings strongly into view. In the study of civilisation, as of so many other branches of natural history, a theory of gradual evolution proves itself a trustworthy guide. But it will not do to assume that culture must always come on by regular unvarying progress. That, on the contrary, the lines of change may be extremely circuitous, the history of games affords instructive proofs. Looking over a playground wall at a game of hockey, one might easily fancy the simple line of improvement to have been that the modern schoolboy took to using a curved stick to drive the ball with, instead of hurling it with his hands as he would have done if he had been a young Athenian of B.C. 500. But now it appears that the line of progress was by no means so simple and straight, if we have to go round by Persia, and bring in the game of polo as an intermediate stage. If, comparing Greek draughts and English draughts, we were to jump to the conclusion that the one was simply a further development of the other, this would be wrong, for the real course appears to have been that some old draught-game rose into chess, and then again a lowered form of chess came down to become a new game of draughts. We may depend upon it that the great world-game of evolution is not played only by pawns moving straight on, one square before another, but that long-stretching moves of pieces in all directions bring on new situations, not readily foreseen by minds that find it hard to see six moves ahead upon a chess-board.

EDWARD B. TYLOR.

## CANADIAN PROTECTION VINDICATED.

THE reasons which have led to the adoption of a protective tariff in Canada require a closer scrutiny in England than they have yet received, if they are to be fully understood. By way of contributing to that end, I shall endeavour in this paper to present a few of the features of the question as they appear from a Canadian protectionist's point of view, in the hope that they may lead to reflection upon the facts which have influenced the Canadian people in regard to it. The present method of treating the subject in England is very simple, and leads, by a short road, to very definite conclusions. It is taken for granted that the colonists are deficient in culture, and especially backward in their education in political economy—that with the progress of time and higher mental attainments the mist will lift from them, and they will see in well-defined outline what they now see only in exaggerated and misshapen proportions. It is to be feared that this view does not get at the root of the matter. It is an admission which palpable facts demand, that there is a class of leaders of thought in England who are vastly superior in culture to any class in Canada. But the average intelligence of the people—the intelligence which leaves its mark in the ballot-box—is probably about the same in both countries. And Canadians, it is not to be forgotten, come in contact with the higher culture of England. They are, at least, a reading people, and they read English books. English literature has a vastly better opportunity of influencing their thoughts and moulding their convictions than the literature of any other country. No other literature, indeed, has a foothold worth speaking of among them, except the literature of their newspaper press, and in that line free trade has not suffered for the want of zealous advocacy. It cannot be affirmed that every Canadian who voted in favour of a protective tariff at the last election had read Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Cairnes, or Fawcett; but it can be affirmed with truth that the works of these authors are extensively read in Canada. These teachers have had the scholars, whatever the result of their teaching has been. Canadians, too, keep themselves acquainted with the current phases of thought in England. The writers and orators of the mother country have the colonists for an audience, either through the medium of English newspapers or periodicals, or through the medium of their own press. These agencies, of course, operated in favour of the free trade view, and were not the only ones which did so.

It is not through ignorance that people grow out of cherished

beliefs into opposite ones. In such a process there must at least be activity of thought. The idols of the mind may be strengthened in their position by ignorant appeals, but they cannot be dispossessed except by an exercise of the reasoning faculties. Now this is the process which Canadian thought has undergone upon this question. Some one has said that the opinions of a colony are but exaggerations of those of the mother country, and where there is no political quarrel between the two there is much truth in the observation. A considerable proportion of the men who, by age, ability, and experience, are now leaders in Canadian affairs, had their opinions on this subject moulded by the free trade movement in England while their minds were yet in the plastic state, and capable of receiving vivid impressions. This is true both as regards immigrants and natives of the country. The opinions impressed upon their minds by that movement were not made fainter by distance. On the contrary, they were deepened by it—deepened by the association of those opinions with the glories of the old home of their affections—glories which either lived in their youthful memories, or had been pictured to their youthful imaginations. Not to leaders alone does this apply, but also to the mass of the population. How come such men to grow out of their preconceived opinions and reach conclusions of the very opposite kind? That is, if these conclusions are really opposite. For it is to be kept in mind that Canadian protectionists do not profess to have found a theory which is suitable for every country; they do not concern themselves with the question of whether or not it is suitable for any other country. They neither affirm nor deny that free trade is the best system for the whole world, if the whole world were to adopt it. They affirm morely that under present circumstances a protective tariff is a necessary condition of the industrial development of Canada. It is not a violation of any rule of fair discussion to tell them that they are wrong, but they will never be convinced of their error by merely flouting their supposed ignorance. To leave out of account the essential facts upon which they rest their case, inspires no confidence in them that their English opponents understand the question in its relation to Canada. Immutable principles, it is true, will harmonise with every fact embraced within their scope, but this is begging the question. The dispute here is about the immutability of the principles, and in order to establish their claim to that high position with Canadian protectionists it is necessary to grapple with the facts which in their opinion contradict them. Unless this method is adopted, no rational progress can be made towards solving the question at issue.

The work before us in Canada is very different from that which confronts the people of Great Britain. Canadians have half a continent to reclaim from its state of wilderness. Their part is to clear

the land of its forest, to develop its natural resources, to stud it with cities, and, in short, to invest it with all the accessories of civilised life. To carry on this work as speedily and effectively as possible is attractive to their aspirations. By being transplanted to other climes and placed under new conditions they have not lost the spirit of the race to which they belong. The conquest of new Gib-raltars and other keys of empire by force of arms does not lie in their pathway, but the development of the vast region committed to their charge meets them at the very first step in that pathway, and evokes the inherited energy of their character. That work, too, is in harmony with their mere selfish instinct, which after all is the primitive impulse of every progressive industrial system. English-men appear to think that the effective way to prosecute that work is for Canadians to settle upon their waste lands, clear the forest, and till the soil. Canadian experience says that that is only the principal part of the work, and that, without the adjuncts springing from diversity of employment, even that part cannot be effectively carried on. In order that the soil may be cultivated to the best advantage, it is necessary that there should be a good home market for the absorption of its products, or at least of a principal part of them. Canadian farmers, of course, may grow the cereal grains, and will find a ready market for them abroad. But the soil rebels against the continued growth of a single crop. Its powers give out under that mode of culture, and suffer serious impairment by even a restricted choice of crops. An ample rotation of crops is necessary to keep the soil in good heart, and such a rotation cannot be adopted without a present loss, unless there is a market in which the farmer can sell the products which the rotation system requires him to raise. Many of these products will not bear export at all, and others of them only at a serious loss. Experience shows that in the absence of the required market the worst of the two evils is selected; the farmer avoids the present loss by drawing upon the powers of the soil for that which will yield a present return. The process of deterioration sets in and agriculture suffers. Its attractiveness to new settlers is lessened by unpleasant examples; the work before us, in fact, goes on in a halting and unsatisfactory manner. Even in the comparatively well-settled districts of Canada the state of agriculture is often such as to excite the derision of Englishmen. They do not stop to consider that the rude farming is fulfilling its conditions as perfectly as the high-class farming of England is. If it is not better, it is because it would not pay to make it so. The demand for its products marks the limit beyond which it cannot advance. If, therefore, the tilling of the soil really were the only natural employment for Canadians, it cannot go forward under progressive conditions unless other employments cluster around it.

The Canadian farmer, then, has a deep interest in the development of non-agricultural communities, directly dependent upon other branches of industry for their livelihood, but creating a demand for an increased variety of farm products. Thirty-five years ago, for example, in what are now the large towns of Canada, apples could be purchased for ten cents (about fivepence) per bushel; they would not be dear now in the same places at fifty cents. It costs no more to raise them now than it did then, and the increase of price, therefore, is the farmer's gain. But the consumer has suffered, says the free trader. Not so; for in these times there were no consumers of apples worth speaking of in the districts referred to who did not themselves raise apples. To export the apples to the markets of another country increased their price to the consumer, without any benefit to the Canadian grower of them. The consequence was that while Nature was attending to her share of the work of developing the Canadian orchard, the owner of it neglected his. He had no inducement to work at what did not remunerate him for the sacrifice. He sought no improvement in fruit-culture. A new variety of the apple, which English fruit-growers would eagerly grasp at, or new mode of culture, had no practical interest for him. A considerable portion of his apples were allowed to lie on the ground where they fell from the trees; another portion were allowed to rot for the want of proper care—that is, for the want of work which it would not pay to perform. This was absolute loss, which benefited nobody. As with apples, so with other products of the farm, which, either from their perishable nature or their bulk, could not be exported, or could not be exported with satisfactory results. I must not be misunderstood as saying that we have no markets for such products in Canada now. In this respect, indeed, the progress made, though not brilliant, has been fair. But the country has not the advantage of such markets to the full extent which is possible to it; and under the free trade system, its industrial relations to the United States are such that it would lose what it has gained. To preserve what has been accomplished, and attain what is possible to accomplish, in this respect forms the taproot of Canadian protectionism. Whether or not the Canadian farmer will pay a little more for his manufactured goods under protection than under free trade, is not the essential question. What concerns him, economically speaking, is the purchasing power which the products of his farm place at his command; and that question requires a consideration of how much he gets for what he has to sell, as well as how much he pays for what he must buy. A languid market to sell in may be very inadequately compensated for by a cheap market to buy in. Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest is very good advice when restricted to individual operations; but the system



which compels you to sell in the cheapest market, because you buy in the cheapest, is not so obviously an advantage. I hope to be able to show that a protective tariff, properly applied, does not increase the price of the protected article, but that point will meet us further on.

Another reason why Canadian farmers are interested in developing home markets for their products is that they furnish employment for their families as well as for themselves. If the work which young people of both sexes can do upon a farm is made useless for the want of a market for the products of their labour, it must be clear that the farm cannot produce up to the full measure of its possibilities, apart altogether from the effects upon the soil of this or that kind of culture. The milk and butter of the farm are not gathered by the farmer or his hired man, nor is the poultry reared by their care. These matters are intrusted to the farmer's wife, his daughters, and his younger sons. Some of the products which come under this head can be exported, but none of them without serious deterioration in their commercial value. No people in the world, for instance, have better butter to eat than Canadians; but the buyers of Liverpool give a very uncomplimentary opinion of Canadian butter by the time it reaches them. Besides, a farmer's boys do not all grow up with tastes and aptitudes fitting them to become farmers. A considerable proportion of them have inclinations for other employments, and if these are not to be had, the talents which seek them are either misapplied—and, consequently, inefficiently employed—or the youngsters seek in the United States the congenial employment which they cannot find in their own country. This natural desire for congenial employment goes by a very uncomplimentary description in English newspapers. Young Canadians of stalwart frame and muscular limbs, these newspapers tell us, would rather measure tape behind a counter than follow the plough upon the farm. There are cases, no doubt, in which this depreciatory language is justified; but it no more formulates a rule in Canada than it would if applied to the young men of Great Britain. It is estimated, for example, that there are over half a million of native Canadians in the United States. They are not leading a lazy life there. On the contrary, they are to be found in large numbers in positions of responsibility and trust, which are open only to energy, integrity, and ability. There is no quicker passport to employment in the Western States than Canadian birth and training, and the high reputation which Canadians have won there could not have had its birth in the love of an indolent life, as any traveller can satisfy himself who inquires after them in any of the large cities of the West. A desire for work suitable to their tastes, in which their talents are of the greatest value to them, accounts for their being where they are. To a country

whose chief need is an increased population, their almost enforced expatriation is a serious loss. Even if by family affection, patriotism, or other tie of adequate strength, they could have been kept at home, their lives would have been more or less a failure for the want of a suitable sphere for their activities. If I have made myself clearly understood, it will be apparent that one of the pressing wants of Canada is such a diversity of employment as the natural resources of the country will admit of. Harmony between condition and function is well understood by English philosophers as a promoter of human welfare; the law holds good in Canada as well as elsewhere.

If diversity of employment, then, is a condition of such progress as will satisfy Canadian aspirations and promote in the most effective degree the settling of the country's unoccupied lands, the necessity for a manufacturing industry is made out, because it is in that department that its industrial system is the most deficient. Let me observe here that Canadian protectionists concern themselves only with such branches of industry as the country has the natural facilities for carrying on. They ask for no protection upon muslins, for instance, because the climate is not thoroughly suitable for their manufacture, so far as investigation has yet shown. I doubt whether printed calicoes would come within the practical operation of their policy, for the reason that the contributory agency of colourists, engravers, and the like, is not at hand. They ask no protection upon iron ships, because there is not a sufficient market for them in Canada to admit of their being economically produced. In these and all similar cases the Canadian protectionist favours importation free of duty, if the necessities of the Finance Minister will permit.

Is it desirable, then, that the industries in which the country lags behind should be promoted by a protective tariff? To obtain even a tolerant consideration of that question in England, it is necessary to examine some of the commonly received objections to such a policy. A protected industry, says the free trader, is sluggish and inefficient; the spur which foreign competition gives being removed, it languidly pockets its extra gains, unjustly taken from the pockets of the consumers, falls into slipshod methods, turns its back upon improvement, and becomes, in short, a sickly hothouse plant, to use the common figure of speech provided by free trade philosophy.

Is all this true? It has not been regarded as true by intelligent observers from a Canadian point of view. The protected industry of the United States does not, in a single feature, resemble the description. That industry has long been characterized by nimbleness in its adaptations, by a swift insight into the wants of the people whom it catered for, and a responsive genius in meeting them. Its multifarious inventiveness may not have been clearly seen by

Englishmen, because it has run in different grooves from their own—grooves which it was pressed into by the necessities for labour-saving devices, such as were provided for by cheap labour in England. The endless variety of churns, washing machines, wringers, apple-parers, and the like, which engaged its attention at an early period, and has done so ever since, are not evidence that its powers have been frittered away upon trifles, but merely that it took hold of the first work which was cut out for it by the wants which pressed to be supplied. Under the pressure of greater wants it advanced to the invention of the best wood-working tools in the world, both for hand and steam use. In agricultural implements, stoves, carriages, household furniture, and all the machinery connected with their manufacture, it is not surpassed by the inventive genius of any other country. These are among its earlier achievements; what it has accomplished in late years—still under protection—in wider fields, as in woven fabrics and ironwork, need not be told here: by this time it is known in England. In enterprise the manufacturers of the United States have shown no backwardness; it is the opposite fault with which they can more fairly be charged. Its artisans are as dexterous in manipulation, as hard-working and industrious, as those of any other country, and far more intelligent in all matters pertaining to their handicrafts than those of most countries. Their social relations with their employers are very different from those which exist between English workmen and their masters, but the almost common level upon which the former meet is not allowed to interfere with efficiency of work. In the manufactories of the United States the impulse which propels is an eager desire to turn out the greatest possible quantity of products with the least possible quantity of labour. Within late years others besides Canadians have had an opportunity of observing the results of American industry, and sluggishness, I venture to think, has not been suggested by the inspection. If English manufacturers still believe that the industrial machinery of a protected country is necessarily imperfect, it is they, and not their foreign competitors, who are reposing in a sleepy hollow. The theory of a figurative hothouse plant does not stand the test of facts.

But is a protective tariff necessary to develop a manufacturing industry in Canada? The free trader tells us that it is not; that industry, he affirms, will come in its own proper time, through the operation of natural causes. If men work farms instead of factories, it is because the farms offer a more profitable investment for their capital than the factories do. When that condition changes, the factories will attract the capital instead of the farms. Now, waiting for the overflow of capital from farms which have not been able to yield their proper increase for the want of adequate markets would

be a dreary business, in which neither this nor several succeeding generations would have the slightest interest. It may be argued that capital from abroad would seek the new field of investment, when the proper time came, in preference to the old. It must be remembered, however, that Canada is exceptionally situated; and if her exceptional circumstances have all the force which Canadian protectionists believe, it is needless to examine the general question of the natural development of a manufacturing industry. Canada is the close neighbour of the United States, with its manufacturing industry such as I have described, and an opulence of capital far beyond what Canada possesses. The United States, as I have said, are a protectionist country, always have been so, with but fitful modifications of its tariff, and have every appearance of remaining so. They are not without free traders, but these are few, unorganized, and powerless. Throughout the whole of the depression there has not been even the appearance of a free trade agitation, and there is no such agitation impending. The people of that country do not believe that protection has been an injury to them, and in all other matters where they have the opportunity of observing they are certainly not fools. No Canadian manufacturer can enter the markets of that country with his wares to sell; under free trade every Canadian manufacturer is exposed to the inroads of the manufacturers of that country. Look at the unvarnished facts. A capitalist seeking investment for his means has both sides of the boundary line to choose from. On the American side he has the markets of both countries open to him, on the Canadian side he is shut out from those of the United States, but is exposed to their competition in his own. He has everything to lose and nothing to gain by selecting the Canadian side. On what ground may we expect him to choose the side which is the wrong one for his own interest?

In regard to the industries now established in the two countries, the unequal conditions just described give rise to some phenomena in competition, which Englishmen, I fancy, are but little acquainted with, or at least have not had long to reflect upon. They are such as must not only prevent the development of Canadian manufactures, but must also extinguish the progress already made in that direction unless preventive measures of some kind are adopted. A consideration of these phenomena is necessary to an understanding of Canada's position on this question. But first a few words as to matters which preceded and led up to them.

In 1859 the tariff of Canada was advanced to 20 per cent., the reason given for the advance being the necessities of the revenue. That duty was imposed upon the great bulk of the manufactured articles which the country had previously imported. Up to that time the manufactures of Canada were very few and very feeble. Under the

stimulus of the new tariff they began to develop. Two years afterwards the Southern rebellion broke out, and practically it had all the effects upon Canada of a high protective tariff against the United States down to 1873. It kept the American manufactures out of the Canadian market in all competing branches of trade, owing to the inflated prices caused by the war. Canadians had what free traders call the monopoly of the market during these years. The young industries of the country grew in strength under the operation of American exclusion, and gave employment to additional thousands. The country prospered as it had never done before, and the farming community felt the beneficial effects. More attention was given than before to all kinds of improvements in the cultivation of the soil, and also to the raising of better breeds of live stock. The value of farm land near the towns advanced considerably, and the annual income from it increased. The conditions of a full progress were in large measure fulfilled. In 1868, from political reasons connected with Confederation, the tariff was reduced to 15 per cent. The American war by this time had closed, but the inflated prices in the United States continued, and the reduction of the tariff had no effect, therefore, on Canadian trade. Those Canadians who watched the signs of the times, however, saw that the artificial state of things in the United States could not last, that a collapse was inevitable, and that, as the manufacturing industry of the United States was making prodigious strides, it must have a serious effect upon the growing industries of Canada when it came, by forcing the Americans into the Canadian market with their surplus stocks. The collapse came in 1873, and dark as were the prognostications of its effects upon Canada, they but faintly foreshadowed the reality. The manufacturers of the United States struggled to keep up paying prices in their own market, and made only such sacrifices there as were absolutely forced upon them. Canada, however, as we have seen, had not been a part of their market—their production was not adjusted to its demand. The sacrifices made necessary by the changed relations between demand and supply it was better to make in Canada than in their own country, so that their own markets might suffer the minimum of demoralisation. All that was sold in Canada, either at the actual cost of production or even at a small loss, was an assistance from without towards keeping their factories open and their machinery at work, and was a positive gain so long as they could make a small profit on their home sales, which were the bulk of their business. For several years past the Americans have had two price lists, one for Canada and another for the United States. The price for Canada depends upon the necessity they are under to make sales, and it is often as much as 30 per cent. below their home price. But this was not the only device which

these quick-witted people resorted to to make their neighbours assist them over their period of depression. In some cases they came to the Canadian and demanded, and obtained, a percentage upon all the Canadian's sales as a condition of their keeping out of the Canadian market. In other cases they obtained a lump sum as the price of the same condition. Free traders might exercise their ingenuity by telling us what effect this kind of free trade has upon the consumer. If we multiply the varieties of such devices by the score, we shall still have but an inadequate conception of the conditions under which Canadian industry has been carried on for years past, and how it is that so many engaged in it have sunk into bankruptcy. It has not been a case of the "toughest hide standing longest out" in a fair contest. The Canadian has been almost helpless in the struggle. He could not enter the American market by way of compensating himself for the destruction of his own. The American tariff forbade his approach, and protected the strong against the weak. Whatever else free trade doctrinaires may say in defence of their theory as applied to facts like these, they will scarcely pretend to think that Canadian manufactures could either flourish or continue to exist under such disabilities.

The depression in Canada followed the inroad of the American manufacturers; workmen were dismissed, production was curtailed, and stagnation of trade ensued. The foreign trade of the country—imports and exports—fell from 217,304,516 dols. in 1873, to 170,523,244 dols. in 1878, and the fall has been continuous year after year. But the imports from the United States have not diminished. Notwithstanding the reduced purchasing power of the Canadian people and the reduced price of American goods, the total value of Canada's imports from the United States has actually increased. Canadian commerce is almost altogether with Great Britain and the United States, and the figures of it for the years of the depression are instructive, as the following table will show. It is taken from the official returns of the Canadian Government:—

Year.	Canadian Exports to Great Britain.	Canadian Imports from Great Britain.	Canadian Exports to United States.	Canadian Imports from United States.
	\$	\$	\$	\$
1873	38,743,848	68,522,776	42,072,526	47,735,678
1874	45,003,882	63,076,437	36,244,311	54,283,073
1875	40,032,902	60,347,067	29,911,983	50,805,820
1876	40,723,477	40,734,260	31,933,459	46,070,033
1877	41,567,469	39,572,239	25,775,245	51,312,669
1878	45,941,539	37,431,180	25,244,898	48,631,739

Perhaps Sir George Campbell will look over these figures, and tell the House of Commons—if he has not already done so—what interest the people of Great Britain have in a system which brings about

results like these. It cannot be the interests of British trade in Canada which have moved him to speak in condemnation of Canada's new tariff, for we see, by the table given, that the Americans are "cleaning it out" of the country. A fall of over thirty millions of dollars marks the Canadian imports from Great Britain in the six years, while there is an actual increase throughout in the imports from the United States, giving official proof of what I have just said of the "slaughter" of American goods in the Canadian market. In 1873 the total imports of Canada from all countries amounted to 127,514,594 dols., of which Great Britain contributed 54·52 per cent., and the United States 37·43 per cent. In 1878 the imports were 91,199,577 dols., of which Great Britain contributed 41·04 per cent., and the United States 53·32 per cent.—a very notable transposition surely. If free trade England can no longer compete with protected America in the Canadian market, why should anybody feel angry if Canadians take measures to do it themselves?

Free trade would not restore the lost balance to Great Britain; it would make the discrepancy only the greater. If the depression in Canada had come wholly, or even mainly, from other causes than the pressure of the Americans upon the Canadian market, it is reasonable to suppose that the diminished purchasing power of the Canadians would have shown itself in diminished imports from the United States as well as from other countries. The fact that there has been an increase instead of a decrease under such circumstances, gives a clue to the cause of the intensity and duration of the depression, which will not escape notice. If the quantity instead of the value of these imports could be given, their full effects in displacing Canadian products would be shown. It may be said that with the return of prosperity in the United States, this pressure will be relieved. In some measure no doubt this is true, but the old inflation of price in that country, which kept the Americans out of the Canadian market, will not return without some similar convulsion to that which produced it before. "Hard pan" will be the condition of price for the future, and the temptation to "slaughter" goods in Canada, whenever there is even a temporary glut, will remain. The inducement to strangle every new Canadian rival will be as strong as ever, and the facilities for doing so are ample, so long as the one-sided tariff arrangement lasts and our manufactures are in their nascent state. The very chance of recurring inroads from the United States would be sufficient to deter capitalists from investing their means in this branch of industry, and lead those already engaged in it to keep their sails reefed for the storm that may strike at any moment. It is not fair competition that Canadians fear; but a competition with every advantage on the side of their rivals is one which it would not be bravery, but folly, to rush into. Englishmen have had no such competition as

this. No country can deluge their market with the mere fag-end of its products. A sacrifice of goods on a sufficiently large scale to wrench the British market out of British hands is too large an enterprise to be attempted, and yet the small samples which Englishmen have had of how that process works has been far from pleasant to them. It is different in Canada, where but a very small percentage of the total products of United States factories sacrificed, supplies the whole demand of our small market for the time.

The favourite dogma of free traders, that a protective duty is a burden upon the consumer, by, as they say, increasing the price of the protected article, is not admitted to be true by Canadian protectionists, and as the dogma is usually stated on behalf of free trade it certainly is not true. I do not, of course, speak of temporary fluctuations in price, nor of special causes acting upon it, but of its permanent average. The free trader's belief is that a customs duty is added to the price of the article upon which it is imposed. If the article is imported, according to his theory, the increase of the price goes into the public treasury (even in that case it is but the payment of taxes which must be paid in some form); if the article is made in the country, the increase of the price goes into the pocket of the producer. It is the latter form of the dogma which alone concerns us here, for if the article continues to be imported, it is a clear proof that a customs duty will not cause its manufacture in the country, and protection, therefore, ceases to have any concern with it. Now, if the free trade belief on this point is right, how did the vast reduction in price come about in the United States? A high protective duty was in force during the process, but it was powerless to avert the downward tendency of prices. If the customs duty of that country entered as an element into price, the prices now prevailing there would be very high ones compared with the cost of production, while the fact is that they are admittedly very low. Cotton fabrics of various kinds, for instance, are selling over the retail counter in all the large cities of the Union at a price which is less than the duty upon them. For years past steel rails have been selling at about the same price as in England, but the duty upon them is 28 dols. a ton. In no country in the world are wood-working tools selling at a cheaper price than in the United States, notwithstanding the high duty upon them. But I need not multiply examples—they are as numerous as autumn leaves; and be it remembered that I am not speaking of the price at which United States goods are sold in foreign markets, but in the markets of that country within the scope of its protective tariff, with foreign competition kept out. How are people of common sense to be expected to believe a theory which is contradicted by facts like these?

In Canada there are facts not a few of the same kind. Some few



of our industries, either through accident or design, which escaped notice at the time, have been for years under a protective duty. Vinegar-making is one of these, and the result of the duty upon vinegar is that Canada makes all it uses of that article, except a very small quantity of choice French brands. In the regular course of trade, Canadian vinegar is sold at a price which is less than the specific duty per gallon upon it. How is that accounted for on the free trade theory? Some years ago the Canadian Finance Minister, in his search for revenue, pounced upon manufactured tobacco as an article given over by public sentiment to his own use, and he placed specific *ad valorem* duties upon it, which, according to the quality of the brand, range from 40 to 100 per cent. His expectations were disappointed. Instead of a large revenue from manufactured tobacco, there sprung up factories for manufacturing it. A large importation of the raw leaf—which was free of duty—took place instead of an importation of the manufactured article. The country now has the factories, with the employment they furnish and the demand for farm products which they create, and the Canadian smoker buys his tobacco as cheaply as the smoker of Virginia does, making allowance for the excise duty in each case.

The manufacture of agricultural implements was among the early industries of Canada. It grew into considerable importance without any competition from abroad to speak of, and the little it had was from the United States. For years past the duty upon its products has been  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., and though a few "slaughter" lots from the United States have been sold in Canada during the depression period, it may be said that the Canadian makers supply the whole of their own market. Now according to the free trade theory the purchasers of these implements must be burdened with an extra  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. upon their cost; according to the facts, however, they are not burdened with anything of the kind. The farmers of Canada are supplied with agricultural implements of as good quality as can anywhere be obtained, and at a cheaper price than any foreign country could supply them with. The three branches above referred to have gone through the depression without any determined effort on the part of their rivals in the United States to crush them. They were either too strong or too well protected, or both, to invite the attack, and the cheapness of their products will be admitted by all who look into them.

On the first imposition of a customs duty the temporary effect may be to increase the price, until the machinery of production within the country has adjusted itself to the new conditions. But even a temporary increase does not always take place. When the Canadian tariff was advanced in 1859, for instance, the largest paper-making establishment in the country at once reduced its prices

2 per cent. on all the kinds of paper which it sold. It is a wealthy firm now, and attributes no small share of its success to that shrewd stroke of business. Economic laws are not at variance with these facts, but in harmony with them. The natural cost of production, if we may believe John Stuart Mill—and common sense sustains his view—is the supreme ruler of price. Free competition, it is true, is a necessary condition of the operation of the law, but free competition is not interfered with by a protective tariff. Such a tariff neither shackles its working nor weakens its force. I could point to establishments in Canada which have a real monopoly of the articles they make, but which nevertheless sell at as cheap a price as they could do if they had a thousand competitors. The desire to keep competitors out of the field has all the effects upon them of actual competition. Once competition has brought the price down to the natural cost of production, including an average profit, its functions are ended, whether the competitors are only two or a million. Capital flows into an unusually profitable business, thereby increasing the production and lowering the price, whether the industry is hedged round by a protective tariff or not, and it leaves again when the pendulum swings to the opposite side. Protection places no embargo on that interaction of economic forces. Besides this, Canadian experience shows that nearly all kinds of domestic products force a shorter and cheaper road from the factory to the consumer than imported products do; the machinery of distribution is simplified by contiguity. The merchant who imports must run considerable risk from miscalculation of his probable demand, must pay a considerable sum in interest and for the services of financial agencies, not to mention the cost of transport. These are saved for the most part when the factory is close to the mercantile warehouse.

If the tariff does not increase the price, how does it benefit the manufacturer? The answer is easy. The manufacturer is not interested in the percentage of profit exclusively which he makes, but in the aggregate amount of it, and a large trade may be more profitable to him on a small percentage of profit than a small trade on a large percentage. Production on the large scale, too, gives opportunity for more effective division of labour, and hence to economy of production. And to this may be added the lessened proportionate burden upon fixed expenses. It is the conditions which will induce this production on a large scale which the Canadian manufacturers seek through a protective tariff.

I hope that the foregoing remarks have at least suggested the thought, that in order to ascertain the bearings of this question as it relates to Canada, it is necessary to take into account the circumstances of that country, and at least to pay some attention to the facts of Canadian experience. That method may not change the opinion

of any one in England regarding the issue between free trade and protection, but it can scarcely fail to correct many mistakes which now exist. The facts I have presented seem to Canadian protectionists to have an important bearing upon the question. They are not nearly all that could be offered, and many features of the subject are left untouched, because they cannot be embraced within the limits of a single paper. If English economists will discuss this question in the light of the facts which present themselves from the Canadian point of view, they will be attentively listened to in Canada. Discussing it as if no such facts existed may be philosophically correct, but the discussion can have no influence upon the public mind of Canada.

It does not appear to Canadian protectionists that the people of England have the slightest reason to fear that their trade interests will suffer by Canada's adoption of a protective tariff. The country will not, of course, manufacture all that it consumes; it will still depend upon England for much of its supply, a much larger supply than it has drawn from the old country for several years past. If the new policy answers the expectations of its advocates, an increase instead of a decrease of British imports into the country will be one of its results.

D. McCULLOCH.

## ANCIENT IDEAS RESPECTING THE ARRANGEMENT OF CODES.

ALMOST the first thing which is learnt by the student of Roman law is, that the classical jurists of Rome divided the whole body of legal rules into the Law of Persons, the Law of Things, and the Law of Actions. Although, however, his studies, as law is now taught amongst us, may soon introduce him to some vehement disputes as to the meaning of this classification, he may be long in becoming alive to the extent and importance of the literature to which it has given birth. It would seem, in fact, that in the seventeenth century, which was a great juridical era, theories of legal classification took very much the place of those theories of law reform which so occupied the minds of the last generation of Englishmen. The continuous activity of legislatures is an altogether modern phenomenon; and, before it began, an intellect of the type of Bentham's, instead of speculating on the possibility of transforming the law into conformity with the greatest happiness of the greatest number, or with any other principle, speculated rather on the possibility of rearranging it in new and more philosophical order. The improvement in view was thus rather a reform of law-books than a reform of law. The most extreme example of such theories is, perhaps, to be found in the attempt of Domat to distribute all law under its two "great commandments" as set forth in the twenty-second chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel—love to God and love to one's neighbour. But on the whole the arrangement in which the compilers of Justinian's Institutes followed Gaius, distributing law into Law of Persons, Law of Things, and Law of Actions, became the point of departure for theories of legal classification. Its history has been not unlike that of several equally famous propositions. After long neglect, it came to be regarded as an expression of absolute truth, and an essential and fundamental distinction was assumed to exist between the three great departments into which the Romans divided law. English jurisprudence was, no doubt, very little affected by this assumption, but English lawyers occasionally come across the inferences from it when they have to deal with Private International law, or, in other words, with the conditions upon which one community will recognise and apply a portion of the jurisprudence of another. At a later date certain difficulties were observed in the rigorous application of the Roman doctrine, and much ingenuity was expended in removing them, or explaining them away. Finally it was pronounced to be theoretically untenable, and only deserving

of being retained on account of its historical importance. According to the general agreement of modern writers on jurisprudence, the Roman distribution of law into Law of Persons, Law of Things, and Law of Actions, must be regarded as now exploded.

As a perfect classification of legal rules would distribute them according to their real relations with one another, and would, therefore, be founded on a complete analysis of all the legal conceptions, the subject has not lost its interest for very powerful minds in this century. The speculations of Austin on classification almost fill such writings of his as remain to us, and a valuable essay of John Stuart Mill on these speculations may be read in the second volume of his *Dissertations and Discussions*. On the Continent of Europe, a more practical interest has been given to such questions by the gradual codification of the law of the whole civilised world, except England and the countries under the influence of the English legal system; for a Code must be arranged somehow, and few would deny that the more philosophical the arrangement the better. But the great majority of writers on the subject, whatever their title to be heard, are agreed in depreciating the Roman classification and all classifications descended from it, and sometimes their censure is surprisingly strong. This modern fashion of decrying, and even of reviling, the arrangement of the Roman Institutes threatens to produce some reaction, and I see that a manful attempt to rehabilitate it has been made in America. There is, perhaps, little use in directing attention to a book published at Chicago, and written by a Law Professor of the State University of Iowa; but Mr. Hammond's Preface to the American issue of Mr. Sandars's well-known edition of the *Institutes of Justinian* contains much the best defence I have seen of the classical distribution of law. My own opinion is that the now common depreciation of this distribution is not so much mistaken as misplaced. The legal classifications proposed by the most modern thinkers on these subjects are classifications of legal Rights. Every one of such systems has legal Right for its centre and pivot. But, singular as the fact may appear to those unacquainted with it, the Romans had not attained, or had not fully attained, to the conception of a legal Right, which seems to us elementary. According to the general usage of the Roman lawyers Jus meant not "a right," but "law," and usually a particular branch of law. There are, undoubtedly, certain senses of Jus in which the meaning of "right" is approached, and even closely approached; but, on the whole, the Romans must be considered to have constructed their memorable system without the help of the conception of legal Right. We have constantly to be on our guard against illusions produced by the undoubted stability of law as compared with other provinces of thought. Some modern writers speak of the Romans as if they were

to blame for not having clearly conceived a legal Right ; even Mill speaks of their language on the point as "unhappy ;" but the truth is, and it is very impressive, that the legal idea of a Right was very slowly evolved. In the minds of the Roman lawyers it was entangled with other notions, and was therefore obscure. In the Middle Ages it became clearer, doubtless through its examination by the scholastics. But, unquestionably, a clear and consistent meaning was, for the first time, given to the expression "a right" by the searching analysis of Bentham and Austin. I object, therefore, to the contemptuous language sometimes applied to the Roman map of the provinces of law, as in effect taxing persons who had not yet attained to the conception of a legal Right, with not having anticipated methods of classification of which Rights are the basis. In order to give their due to the ancient lawyers who first divided law into Law of Persons, Law of Things, and Law of Actions, we must try to bring home to ourselves the view of the field of law which this division superseded ; and then we shall see, I think, that the new arrangement may have been a great feat of abstraction. The object of this paper will be to show what was the original Roman notion of the contents of a legal system ; but it will derive such interest as it possesses from the light which the inquiry throws on certain primitive ideas regarding law and justice which appear to have been once diffused over a great portion of mankind.

The respect, which once amounted to reverence, for the classification of law in the Roman Institutes, though it has had time to culminate and decline, is relatively modern. There is no reason to suppose that the Roman lawyers set any extraordinary value on it. It was confined to their Institutional treatises or primers of law, the educational manuals placed in the hands of beginners. The student was soon advanced to the Prætorian Edict, and the greatest part of his pupilage was passed in the close examination of it, and in reading the numerous commentaries of which it was the text. But the Edict of the Prætor, even when consolidated by Julianus, did not divide law into Law of Persons, Law of Things, and Law of Actions. The Twelve Tables, older than the Edict, have no trace of this classification ; nor has any later compendium of Roman law. The Gregorian and Hermogenian Codes were arranged upon a different principle ; so was the Code of Theodosius the Second ; so, manifestly, are the Code and Digest of Justinian. When the study of Roman law revived in the Middle Ages, it was not the arrangement of the Institutes which regulated the course of legal study soon followed by thousands of students. As may be seen from Mr. Hammond's Preface, the mediæval teachers followed the so-called "legal order," that is, the actual order of legal topics in the text of the book before the class. The ascendancy of the classification of the Institutes in fact took its

rise in dissatisfaction with this "legal order." It survived in the law-schools, says Mr. Hammond, to the end of the eighteenth century, consequently till after the time of Blackstone; "but the increased importance of the Institutes in the plan of study gradually made their arrangement to be regarded as the basis of all scientific systems of jurisprudence." It has now, however, become plain, and with regard to matters far more important than legal classification, that much which the eighteenth century abandoned in the name of science and in equally respectable names must be recovered and re-examined, if the thread of human thought is ever to be knitted anew. What then was the "legal order," which appears in the Roman Digest and Code, and which, when those bodies of law were put together, had already maintained its place for about ten centuries in the legal records of a society of pre-eminent legal genius? I think that the question will be found to have more than a merely technical and more than a merely antiquarian interest.

The arrangement of legal topics which can be shown to have been extraordinarily persistent in the Roman law is first discovered in the fragments of those Twelve Tables which to the last were its theoretical basis. The contents of all the Tables except the Eleventh and Twelfth have been known in a general way since the time of Gothofred; but we are now only under the necessity of attending to the subjects of the first three, and especially of the First. This First Table of the primitive Code contained a number of rules *de in jus vocando*, on the first steps in a judicial proceeding, on summons to the defendant, and on the excuses—or, to employ the later Teutonic word which found its way into our own early law—the "essoins," which he might make for not attending. The Second Table had to do, first, with the Procedure to be followed when the case was actually in Court, and next (so it is commonly believed) with *theft*; it went at once from legal procedure to the fraudulent subtraction of a movable. The Third Table contained rules as to Deposits. We need not go further, and all which must be recollected is that the earliest Roman Code treated first of legal procedure, and then, either at once or shortly afterwards, dealt with the subjects of Thefts and Deposits; all the other heads of law discussed in the remaining Tables followed the same apparently hap-hazard arrangement. Let us now turn to the Prætorian or Perpetual Edict, the body of Roman Equity jurisprudence as opposed to the Roman Common Law constructed out of the Twelve Tables and out of the accretion of legal rules which had them for a nucleus. The Edict had unquestionably an order of subjects of its own. I will not now discuss the time at which, or the mode in which, this order first appeared. It began with a title manifestly corresponding to the First Decemviral Table, though usually given in different words, *de actione danda*. The

Second Title, like the Second Table, dealt with Procedure in Court. Deposit was treated of in the Third Title; but Theft, instead of taking the first place after Procedure, as it is thought to have done in the primitive Code, occupied the last part of the Fourth Title, in which it was preceded by Marriage Portions and Tutelage. There is a general but not exact correspondence with the Twelve Tables throughout the remaining Titles, and on the whole the classification of the Edict looks like a modernised form of the ancient order of the Twelve Tables. It is well established that the distribution of subjects of the Edict was observed in the great mass of Roman legal literature, and that it influenced the earlier attempts at codification, but it was long a matter of dispute whether it determined the order followed in the Code and Digest of Justinian. At first sight there is no trace of resemblance or correspondence, but the reason is that a great quantity of prefatory matter introduces the true classification in both of these famous compilations. In the Code the preface is ecclesiastical; in the Digest there are first some general propositions about law, and then an account of various Imperial officers connected with the administration of the law or having some sort of jurisdiction. The real body of the Digest commences at the Fourth Title of the Second Book, and begins with the very subject of the First Table of the Decemviral Law, *de in jus vocando*. A close correspondence between these earliest and latest monuments of Roman law may be discerned running through no less than nineteen books of the Digest: only Theft has dropped into an obscurity characteristic of modern as distinguished from ancient law.

From this brief summary of an inquiry which has occupied the minds of several generations of learned men, it would appear that the form of the Roman law throughout the whole course of its history was strongly influenced by the primitive arrangement of subjects in the Twelve Tables. Have we any clue to the meaning or principle of this ancient legal classification? At first sight it is simply disorderly, even less capable of being referred to any dominant notion than the arrangement of our classical English Digest, Bacon's *Abridgement*, which begins with "Plea in Abatement to the Jurisdiction of a Court," and goes on to treat of Ambassadors and Attorneys, but which at all events may lay claim to the convenience of an alphabetical order. The suspicion, however, that some light might be thrown on the arrangement of the Twelve Tables by what has more recently been called Comparative Jurisprudence is not new. Ever since the earliest and purest of the Teutonic Codes, the Frankish *Lex Salica*, has been examined, it has been seen that it exhibited some curious general resemblances to the course of legal topics followed in all the monuments of Roman law except the Institutes.



The first title is *de mannire*, on Summons to a Court, thus exactly answering to the First of the Roman Tables, and to the First Title of the Edict. The next seven Titles are concerned with Thefts, just as was the second part of the Second Roman Table. The Salic titles on thefts of swine, thefts of kine, thefts of tame birds, and so forth, succeed one another down to the ninth title, where the subject of Trespass is taken up; but the code-maker immediately returns to Theft, and though he interrupts himself to treat of Homicide and other serious crimes, he is constantly recurring to Theft throughout a great part of the Code. The title corresponding most nearly to the Roman Deposits does not present itself till the middle of the Salic Law is reached: it is numbered "fifty," and has the barbarous Latin heading *de fides factas*; but it is most elaborately framed, and has furnished plentiful food to modern German erudition. The fact remains that the German Salic Law begins, as did the Roman Twelve Tables, committing what to a modern legal eye is the paralogism of placing the Law of Action in front of the law; that, like the Twelve Tables, it gives a very high place to Theft—in modern law one of the most insignificant of subjects; and that it elaborately discusses contractual obligations, but that it puts them in no place in the smallest degree corresponding to that reserved in the Roman Institutes for the Law of Contract. These resemblances, as I stated, attracted notice some time ago; but it was matter of dispute whether they proved anything more than that the Frankish code-maker had heard something of the Roman "legal order." On the one side the strong probability might be urged that the Theodosian Code had something to do with the Frankish codification; on the other, it might be said that the substantive law of the Lex Salica shows no signs of derivation from the Roman jurisprudence. It is purely barbarous. Again, the order of topics in the Lex Salica is not that of the later Roman law, which the Frank might conceivably have followed, but that of the earliest Roman law, of which it is almost impossible that he can have known anything. After Procedure, the Salic Law deals with Theft. So, according to the better opinion, did the Twelve Tables; but in the later Roman law Theft had become a criminal offence, and not one of any importance. The fact is, the prominent place assigned to Theft is a distinctive mark of barbarous law. It belongs to the period when movables are of far higher value than immovables, personal property than land. No surer inference can be drawn from the insistence of a lawgiver on Theft, than that the community for which he legislated had more land than sufficed for cultivation, and that the common prey of violence or fraud was the movable; the slave, the domestic animal, or the ornament or utensil which was the product of workmen making up for unskilfulness by laboriousness.

The arguments against the derivation of the Salic from the Roman arrangement have always seemed to me to preponderate, independently of new materials for an opinion. But these new materials place the matter beyond a doubt. By itself indeed the lately revealed Irish law would carry us a very little way. Its great peculiarity is the extraordinary prominence it gives to Procedure. The principal Irish law-book, pretending to be a Code and claiming in its preface to have been framed when "Theodosius was monarch of the world," is almost wholly taken up with the law of Distress. Undoubtedly we have here the Celtic counterpart of the First Roman Table, *de in jus vocando*. Distraint is the ancient Irish method, and probably it was once the Greek, the Roman, the German, and the Hindu method, possibly it was the universal method, of *vocatio in jus*, of compelling a person complained against to come into Court and submit the quarrel to arbitration or adjudication. The state of things is that of which we have a bare trace in Roman and Hindu, but traces somewhat more abundant in Teutonic law: you, having received an injury, so far availed yourself of the primitive natural remedy of forcible reprisals that you used it, with the sufferance or under the control of the law, to compel your adversary to come into Court. But, though this amount of correspondence is manifest, no further resemblance to the Roman Twelve Tables can be discovered amid the singular confusions of the Irish jurisprudence. The subject discussed in the great Code, the *Senchus Mor*, next after Distress is the law of "Hostage-securities," and it may certainly be asserted that this must have been an important branch of law amid a community perpetually belligerent like the ancient Irish. But in fact a great part of law is incidentally discussed in the *Senchus Mor* under the head of Distress, and it must on the whole be admitted that neither in that nor in any other Irish law-book is there any clear sign of designed classification. All we can say with confidence is—and this is an important proposition—that the Irish Brehon lawyers regarded the mode of bringing of a defendant into Court as the legal topic which rightfully and naturally took precedence of all others.

It appears to me that the key to these mysteries may be found in those Hindu law-books which have been more or less known to us under the extremely inappropriate name of Codes. One of them has been long accessible to English students through the translation of Sir William Jones, and this so-called Code of Manu is still believed by all orthodox Hindus to be the very collection of "sacred laws" which Manu, "whose powers were measureless," declared to the "divine sages" who approached him as he "sat reclined with his attention fixed on one object." But the sacred laws thus promulgated in no way answer to the modern conception of a Code.

They are contained in a book which, among other things, is a treatise on the seen and unseen worlds, on the art of government, and on the various classes of Hindu society. Similarly the Christian Brehon laws are found mixed up with discussions on cosmogony and logic; and the Roman Twelve Tables clearly consisted in some parts of ritual. The Code of Manu would in fact by itself suggest that Law, as a subject of conscious reflection, is the result of a gradual evolution. It was not at first dissociated from all sorts of propositions on matters which affect life in this world or the next. The Sanscritists of our day are not, I believe, at all inclined to concede to these Hindu law-books that vast antiquity which was once claimed for them. Following a theory of Professor Max Müller, they trace the rhythmical texts of the Codes to collections of maxims expressed in language so concise as to fasten themselves on the memory, and finally to their fountain-head in the oldest literature of the Aryan race. But these law-books once framed appear to have undergone a further specialisation. Ritual, of which there are plain traces in the Roman Twelve Tables, has a compendium of rules entirely appropriated to itself in that remarkable record of another Italian community, the Eugubine Tables, which till the other day no man could read; and in the book of Narada, now open to the English reader, he will find a version of the "sacred laws" of Manu in which Law proper has been isolated from other subjects, and is regarded very much in the same light in which it would be viewed by the author of a modern Code.

In the mediæval Digests of Hindu law, which are the actual sources of the law now administered in India, Narada is sometimes quoted as of almost equal authority with Manu. In point of fact, both Manu and Narada are entirely mythical, and the books called after their names are probably nothing more than compendia of the teaching of particular Hindu law-schools, formed more or less on the model of a *gens* or clan. Both these law-books pretend to an origin in the sacred laws declared by that Manu who took part in the creation of the world; but the author of the extant book which purports to contain the whole teaching of Manu, quotes "Manu" as a personage distinct from himself, and the preface to the book of Narada describes at length the process by which a supposed original Code of Manu was gradually specialised, until it became at last a treatise on civil law. Manu, says the writer, composed a work which, among other things, told of the creation of the world, spoke of the classification of beings in it, and gave the enumeration of the countries assigned to them, and it contained 100,000 *slokas*, legal texts or verses. Manu delivered it to Narada, who made the very reasonable remark, "This book cannot be easily studied by human beings on account of its length." \*He accordingly abridged it to 12,000

verses, and his disciple, Sumati, further abridged it to 4,000. It is only the gods, says the introduction, who read the original Code. Men read the second abridgment, since human capacity has been brought to this through the lessening of life.

The chief interest of the book of Narada, which has recently been translated into English by Dr. Julius Jölly, of Wurzburg, is that its writer is much more of a pure lawyer than the writer of Manu, and his work is much more nearly a work on law. Both of them were certainly Brahmans. The writer of Manu is intensely sacerdotal, and apparently only contemplates the civil and earthly sanction as a supplement and aid to the spiritual penalty. On the other hand, the author of Narada depends almost wholly on the civil sanction, and his religious character shows itself chiefly in earnest and often very impressive exhortations to observance of the law and of the moral duties implicated with legal obligations. For my present purpose, however, I have only to point out that these Brahmanical code-makers, differing sensibly in some respects from one another, and each probably reflecting the doctrine of some venerated school, agree essentially in their conception of the order and contents of a Code. The classification of subjects which they follow may be seen by examining the eighth chapter of the Code of Manu in Sir William Jones's translation, and it is observed throughout the law-book of Narada. I will describe it from the last, since it is plainer in the more purely legal treatise. The following account of it will be found at page 6 of Dr. Jölly's version in *slokas* 16 to 20 :—

"The eight constituent parts of a legal proceeding are the King, his Officer, the Assessors, the Law-book, the Accountant and Scribe, gold and fire for Ordeals, and water for refreshment.

"Recovery of a Debt, Deposits, Concerns among Partners, Abstraction of Gift, Breach of promised Obedience, Non-payment of Wages, Sale without Ownership, Non-delivery of a Commodity sold, Rescission of Purchase, Breach of Order, Contests about Boundaries, the Duties of Man and Wife, the Law of Inheritance, Violence, Abuse and Assault, Gambling, Miscellaneous Disputes.

"These are the Eighteen Heads of Dispute."

This distribution of subjects is, on the whole, rigorously observed throughout the treatise, except apparently in one particular. The mechanism of a Court of Justice and its procedure are first elaborately described. The King seats himself on the throne with the book of the law in his hands; but, though the justice described is throughout royal justice, the King is significantly directed to follow the opinion of his Chief Judge or Assessor. After a full account of judicature, the writer (subject to a remark which I will make presently) takes up the subject of Evidence, which, in his view, includes Ordeals; and then, having started with a summary of what

we who live in the light of Bentham should call Adjective Law, he proceeds to divide the substantive law into eighteen branches, which he calls "heads of dispute." The order in which he discusses these is that in which he placed them in the passage which I quoted; with this exception, that the first head of dispute, Recovery of a Debt, is interpolated between Judicature and Evidence. This may be the result of a mere accidental disarrangement of the oldest compendia of Hindu law, but it is to be remarked that something like the same misplacing of "recovery of debts" shows itself in the treatise of Manu, and it is conceivable that it may have been caused by the inherent difficulty of explaining adjective law without reference to substantive law, and that one "head of dispute" may have been taken out of its place with the view of furnishing illustrations to the text-writer.

The principle and meaning of this ancient classification strike me as obvious. The compiler of Narada or his original makes the assumption that men do quarrel, and he sets forth the mode in which their quarrels may be adjudicated upon and settled without bloodshed or violence. The dominant notion present to his mind is not a Law, or a Right, or a Sanction, or the distinction between Positive and Natural Law, or between Persons and Things, but a Court of Justice. The great fact is that there now exists an alternative to private reprisals, a mode of stanching personal or hereditary blood-feuds other than slaughter or plunder. Hence in front of everything he places a description of a Court, of its mechanism, of its procedure, of its tests of alleged facts. Having thus begun with an account of the great institution which settles quarrels, he is led to distribute law according to the subject-matter of quarrels, according to the relations between human beings which do, as a fact, give rise to civil disputes. Thus Debt, Partnership, the Marital Relation, Inheritance, and Donation are considered as matters about which men at a certain point of civilisation do, as a fact, have differences, and the various rights and liabilities (as we should call them) to which they give rise, are set forth simply as guides towards determining the judgment which a Court of Justice should give when called upon to adjudicate on quarrels.

It appears to me that this explanation covers the whole of the problem suggested by the classification of subjects in the primitive Codes which I cited. They all seem to begin with Judicature, and to distribute substantive law into "heads of dispute." The Irish law never, indeed, gets farther than the initial steps of procedure. All the learning and ingenuity of the contributing Brehon lawyers are bestowed on defining the rules by which adversaries may be brought under the control of the institution, which the Roman and Hindu Codes assume to have been long since in existence and long since in

active and regular operation. The testimony, however, to the early overshadowing importance of Judicature is all the more striking. As we have seen, the Roman, Frankish, and Hindu Codes also divide the subjects of the quarrels which are the materials for litigation into several branches; and, as to the order in which these "heads of dispute" are taken up, it seems to me that it depends on their relative importance at the time when that order was fixed. I do not at all doubt that the arrangement is in a certain degree at haphazard, but it seems to me that there must have been a meaning in the prominence given to Deposits in the Roman and Hindu law, and in the prominence assigned to Thefts in the law both of the Romans and of the Salian Franks. At the reasons of the special importance of Deposits we can only guess, but I have already stated my opinion that the importance of Thefts belongs to a particular stage of economical and social advance. We can see the signs in Roman law of their dwindling importance, which is exactly what we should expect from the growth of population, from the rising value of land, from the greater plentifulness of capital, and from the freer multiplication of movable articles of use or luxury, and from their consequent relative cheapness. It is curious that, though Theft is not a specific Head of Dispute in the book of Narada, casual allusions to Thefts occur during the discussion of Deposits, possibly derived from an older state of the law.

The suggestion, then, which I offer is that the authority of the Court of Justice overshadowed all other ideas and considerations in the minds of these early code-makers, belonging to societies of the Aryan race so remote from one another and so unlike to one another. The evidence of this position does not solely arise from the probabilities or depend on inference from the construction of the ancient legal compendia. There is a whole literature, the Icelandic, which gives the most vivid impression of the power and majesty of Courts of Justice in an ancient society. It may almost be said that in the Iceland revealed to us by the labour and learning of Konrad Maurer, there is no institution worth speaking of except the Court; all society is moulded round it and all ideas centre in it. It affects all literature, both poetry and prose. It is manifestly in the most intimate relation to every passage, incident, affection, and passion of life. And as the society depicted is in the highest degree bloody and violent, so long as it follows its natural bent, it becomes clear that it is not the Court as we understand it, but the Court standing before all men's sight as the alternative to forcible reprisals, and as the avenger of their victim, which has attained to this commanding altitude. We need not, moreover, go to historical records for the proof that this is a natural condition of men's minds. The phenomena can be reproduced, and are in fact not uncommonly reproduced

in the country which has only lately emerged from the anarchy into which it fell long after the laws of Manu and Narada had ceased to be administered in it by tribunals which they describe. When a province hitherto specially ill-governed is annexed to British India, the first effect ordinarily is neither satisfaction nor discontent, neither the peaceable continuance of old usages nor the sudden adoption of new, but an extraordinary influx of litigation into the British Courts, which are always at once established. The fact occurs too uniformly, and at first sight is too inexplicable, not to have attracted notice, but it has generally been observed upon with regret, and, after a while, when there has been time to forget the original condition of the annexed territory, this new litigiousness is sometimes adduced to show that in exchanging native for British rule a community does not obtain an unmixed blessing. But the proper conclusion to draw is that already drawn in this paper, that Courts of Justice have an immense ascendancy over men's minds and a singular attraction for their tastes, when they are first presented as a means of settling disputes which were either violently adjusted or slumbered because they could only be settled at prodigious risk.

Another phase in the history of Courts of Justice is instructively illustrated in the more settled parts of British India. The commands of the British Indian Government and of the British Indian legislature are far more implicitly obeyed than the commands of any previously existing authority in India, far more implicitly than the orders of the most powerful Mogul Emperors. The law is obeyed in India as uniformly as in England, but then it is much more consciously obeyed. At present (and for a long while to come it will probably be so) the fact of the existence of Courts of Justice regularly enforcing the law is constantly before the minds of the natives of India subject to their jurisdiction, to a degree which we in this country can scarcely conceive. The law and the Court have an importance which may be measured by a circumstance related to me on good authority, that in many parts of India youths learn the texts of the Penal and Procedure Codes in daily lessons, as did the young Romans of Cicero's day the *cantilena* of the Twelve Tables. But with us, I need scarcely say, there is little conscious observance of legal rules. The law has so formed our habits and ideas that Courts of Justice are rarely needed to compel obedience to it, and thus they have apparently fallen into the background. It is only when the law happens to be uncertain, or when facts with which we are concerned happen to get unusually entangled, that most of us, who are not lawyers, ever come into contact with the administration of the law. No doubt the force which arms the law is still there; but it lies in reserve, in (so to speak) a compact and concentrated form, which enables it to keep out of sight. On the whole

the effect of peace and civilisation is to diminish the conscious reverence of mankind for Courts of Justice, and the abiding sense of their importance.

We may believe that the impressiveness of the early Courts of Justice was in part created by what to a modern eye were their infirmities. It would seem that by their side the very practices long survived which it was their object to suppress. The tenderness of early judicial procedure to immemorial barbarism is shown by its partial recognition of the remedy which we call Distrain and the Germans "self-help," the remedy of private reprisals on the property of an adversary; and there is much significant evidence that the early tribunals had no power of directly enforcing their own decrees. The man who disobeyed the order of court went out of the law; his kinsmen ceased to be responsible for his acts, and the kinsmen of those who injured him became also irresponsible; and thus he carried his life in his hand. We cannot then doubt that the violence and bloodshed which the law licensed under certain circumstances were generally rife during the infancy of Courts of Justice, and that their earliest service to mankind was to furnish an alternative to savagery, not to suppress it wholly. Their value and beneficence were therefore probably all the more conspicuous while as yet their power was imperfect and their operation irregular. But gradually, as the sovereign power of the State developed itself, and was more and more placed at the disposal of the tribunals, their decrees became inflexibly effectual. Obedience to them came to be unhesitating and implicit, and a mass of habits and ideas were formed of which the centre and pivot is unquestioning observance of law. This formation of law-abiding habits, and the consequent banishment of the penal sanctions of law into the background, are the secret of many transformations of juridical theory. We have seen that the "legal order" of the Roman Twelve Tables, testifying to the primitive importance of procedure, survived long after it had lost its meaning; but in the Roman State, always relatively well-ordered and in the end the type of order and peace, the force which is the motive-power of law early retreated into the distance. The classification of the Roman Institutes, assigning the Law of Actions not to the first place but to the third and last, is one testimony to the formation of a habit of obedience to the law so confirmed as to be unconscious; but another and more striking piece of evidence is the rise of the conception of the Law of Nature, which is in truth law divorced from its penal sanctions. The retreat out of sight, if I may so speak, of the force which is the motive-power of law, has been even more complete in the modern than in the Roman world; partly because the decrees of Courts of Justice are everywhere inexorable, but also doubtless from the long ascendancy of theories



directly or indirectly descended from the Roman *Jus Naturale*. The great difficulty of the modern Analytical Jurists, Bentham and Austin, has been to recover from its hiding-place the force which gives its sanction to law. They had to show that it had not disappeared and could not disappear; but that it was only latent because it had been transformed into law-abiding habit. Even now their assertion, that it is everywhere present where there are Courts of Justice administering law, has to many the idea of a paradox—which it loses, I think, when their analysis is aided by history.

The primary distinction between the early and rude, and the modern and refined classifications of legal rules, is that the Rules relating to Actions, to pleading and procedure, fall into a subordinate place and become, as Bentham called them, Adjective Law. So far as this the Roman Institutional writers had advanced, since they put the Law of Actions into the third and last compartment of their system. Nobody should know better than an Englishman that this is not an arrangement which easily and spontaneously suggests itself to the mind. So great is the ascendancy of the Law of Actions in the infancy of Courts of Justice, that substantive law has at first the look of being gradually secreted in the interstices of procedure; and the early lawyer can only see the law through the envelope of its technical forms. It would even seem that civilised societies experience reversions towards this condition of thought. There are men still alive, who recollect that the tendency towards active law-reform which was part of the great movement associated with the first Reform Act, first showed itself in an energetic resuscitation of strictness in pleading, so that for many years the practical questions at issue were altogether thrown into obscurity by questions of the proper mode of stating them to the courts. It was the very state of things which existed when the ancient Hundred Courts of the Germans were administering the rude Salic law. The effects of the "New Rules of Pleading" wore away very slowly, and it was only the other day that the Judicature Acts, of which the full influence has not yet been felt, placed the procedure of Courts of Justice on the footing which would naturally be given to it by a society which regards it only as Adjective Law.

The most modern classifiers, again, distribute law not with reference to the distinction between Persons and Things, but with reference to the differences between kinds of Rights. I stated before that the clear conception of a legal right is not ancient, or even Roman, but that it belongs distinctively to the modern world. Doubtless, before it can be realised, the sense of a Court of Justice as ever active and dominating the whole field of law must have somewhat decayed. As regards one great class of Rights, those arising out of Contract and Delict, the Romans unquestionably mixed together the notions

of legal Right and legal Duty. They considered the parties as bound together by a *vinculum juris*, a bond or chain of law, and "Obligation," which is the name for this chain, signified rights as well as duties; the right, for example, to have a debt paid as well as the duty of paying it. As I have said elsewhere, "the Romans kept, in fact, the entire picture of the 'legal chain' before their eyes, and regarded one end of it no more and no less than the other." But it was the Court of Justice which had welded this chain, and the explanation of this and other blended ideas which we can detect in Roman legal phraseology is, I presume, that the dominancy of the Court of Justice over all legal notions still continued to influence the Roman view of law. Although, however, the authors of the Roman Institutional manuals did not invent, and could not have invented, arrangements of law based on classifications of Rights, they did, as we have seen, attain to the conception of law as something distinct from Procedure, and they did conceive it as distributable into the Law of Persons and the Law of Things. The exact relation of these two departments to one another has been keenly disputed by modern writers, and it cannot be conveniently considered here; but anybody who can bring home to himself the ancient ideas of law on which I have sought to throw light may, perhaps, convince himself that the conception of a Law of Things, at all events, was a great achievement in mental abstraction; and that it must have been a man of legal genius who first discerned that Law might be thought of and set forth apart from the Courts of Justice which administered it on the one hand, and apart from the classes of persons to whom they administered it on the other.

H. S. MAINE.

## A PROBLEM IN HUMAN EVOLUTION.

"HARDLY any view advanced in this work," says the illustrious author of the *Descent of Man*, "has met with so much disfavour as the explanation of the loss of hair in mankind through sexual selection." Indeed the friends and foes of Mr. Darwin's great theories have been equally ready, the one party to disclaim and the other party to ridicule the account which the founder of modern philosophic biology has given of the process whereby man, as he supposes, gradually lost the common hairy covering of other mammalia. Mr. Wallace, with all his ability and ingenuity, finds it necessary to call in the aid of a *deus ex machina* to explain the absence of so useful and desirable an adjunct; for he believes that natural selection could never have produced this result, and he therefore feels compelled to put it off upon "some intelligent power," since he denies altogether the existence of sexual selection as a *vera causa*. Mr. J. J. Murphy in his recently published revision of *Habit and Intelligence* has taken up the same ground with a more directly hostile intent; and Spengel has also forcibly given expression to his dissent on the plea of inadequate evidence for the supposed preference. It seems highly desirable, therefore, to prop up Mr. Darwin's theory by any external supports which observation or analogy may suggest, and if possible to show some original groundwork in the shape of a natural tendency to hairlessness, upon which sexual selection might afterwards exert itself so as to increase and accelerate the depilatory process when once set up.

The curious facts for which we have to account are something more than the mere general hairlessness of the human species. In man alone, as Mr. Wallace clearly puts the case, "the hairy covering of the body has almost totally disappeared; and, what is very remarkable, it has disappeared more completely from the back than from any other part of the body. Bearded and beardless races alike have the back smooth, and even when a considerable quantity of hair appears on the limbs and breast, the back, and especially the spinal region, is absolutely free, thus completely reversing the characteristics of all other mammalia." When we consider the comparatively helpless condition to which man has been thus reduced, as well as the almost universal human practice of substituting artificial clothing, derived from the skins or wool of other animals, for the natural apparel which the species has so unaccountably lost, it does not seem surprising that even Mr. Wallace should be staggered by the difficulty, and should fall back upon an essentially supernatural explanation.

The great key to the whole problem lies, it would seem, in the fact thus forced upon our attention, that the back of man forms the specially hairless region of his body. Hence we must conclude that it is in all probability the first part which became entirely denuded of hair. Is there any analogy elsewhere which will enable us to explain the original loss of covering in this the normally hairiest portion of the typical mammalian body? The erect position of man appears immediately to suggest the required analogy in the most hairless region of other mammals.

Almost all animals except man habitually lie upon the under surface of the body. Hence arises a conspicuous difference between the back and the lower side. This difference is seen even in lizards, crocodiles, and other reptiles, amongst which, as a rule, the tegumentary modifications of the under surface are much less extended and less highly differentiated than those of the upper. It is seen amongst birds, which usually have the plumage far less copious on the breast than on the back. But it is most especially noticeable in mammals, which have frequently the under side almost entirely bare of hair, while the back is covered with a copious crop. Now, it would seem as though this scantiness of natural clothing on the under side were due to long-continued pressure against the ground, causing the hair to be worn away, and being hereditarily transmitted in its effects to descendants. We are, therefore, led to inquire whether all parts of the mammalian body which come into frequent contact with other objects are specially liable to lose their hair.

The answer seems to be an easy one. The soles of the feet in all mammals are quite hairless where they touch the ground. The palms of the hands in the quadrumana present the same phenomenon. The knees of those species which frequently kneel, such as camels and other ruminants, are apt to become bare and hard-skinned. The callosities of the old-world monkeys, which sit upon their haunches, are other cases in point; but they do not occur among the more strictly arboreal quadrumana of the American continent, nor among the lemurs, for the habits of these two classes in this respect are more similar to those of ordinary mammals. On the other hand, the new-world monkeys possess a prehensile tail, with which they frequently swing from bough to bough or lower themselves to the ground, and in these creatures, says Cuvier, "*la partie prenante de la queue est nue en dessous*." Wherever we find a similar organ, no matter how widely different may be the structure and genealogy of the animals which possess it, we always find the prehensile portion free from hair. This is the case with the marsupial *tarsipes*, with many rodents, and above all with the opossum, which uses its tail quite as much as any monkey uses its hands. Accordingly its surface is quite bare from end to end, and in some

species scaly—a fact which is rendered more comprehensible when we remember that the young opossums are carried on their mother's back, and hold themselves in that position by curling their tails around hers.

A few more special facts help to bear out the same generalisation. In the gorilla, according to Du Chaillu, "the skin on the back of the fingers, near the middle phalanx, is callous and very thick, which shows that the most usual mode of progression of the animal is on all fours and resting on the knuckles." The ornithorhynchus has a flat tail, on which it leans for support, and this, says Mr. Waterhouse, "is short, depressed, and very broad, and covered with coarse hairs; these, however, are generally worn off on the under side of the tail in adult or aged individuals, probably by the friction of the ground." The toes of the very large forefeet, used in burrowing, are also naked, as are the similar organs in the mole and many other creatures of like habit. The beaver likewise uses his tail as a support, flaps it much in the water, and is said, perhaps not quite erroneously, to employ it as a trowel in constructing his dams; and this tail is entirely devoid of hair, being covered instead with a coat of scales. We can hardly avoid being struck in this instance, as in that of some seals' and sea-lions' flappers, with the analogy of the penguin's wings, which are employed like fins in diving, and have undergone a similar transformation of their feathers into a scale-like form. In the ground-kangaroos, which use the tail as a support trailing behind them on the ground, that organ is again only slightly covered with coarse hairs, almost entirely wanting on the extremity of the under surface; but in the tree-kangaroos, which carry the tail partly erect, it assumes a bushy and ornamental appearance. Like differences occur between the rats and mice on the one hand and the squirrels on the other. In those monkeys which, like *Macacus brunneus*, sit upon their tails, that organ is also bare. To multiply further instances would only prove tedious.

Again, when we look at the only mammals besides man which have denuded themselves of their hairy covering, we find that a great majority of them are water-frequenters. The most completely aquatic mammals, like the whales, porpoises, dugongs, and manatees, though differing widely in structure, are alike in the almost total absence of hair, while the hippopotamus is likewise a smooth-skinned animal. Now, the friction of water is of course far stronger than that of air, and it would seem to have resulted in the total depilation of these very aquatic species. Other less confirmed water-haunters, such as seals and otters, have very close fur, which scarcely at all retards them in their movements when swimming. The elephant and rhinoceros are, indeed, difficult cases to explain; but of course it is not necessary to suppose that no other cause save

that which we are considering can ever produce hairlessness. It will be enough if we can show that the cause actually under examination does with reasonable certainty bring about such an effect.

If, then, the portion of animals which generally comes in contact with the ground or other external bodies acquires in this manner a hairless condition—shown alike in hands, feet, tail, and belly—what will be the result upon animals which are gradually acquiring the erect position? Of this we can obtain an almost complete series by looking first at the beaver, which rests upon its scaly tail alone; then at the baboons, which rest upon the naked callosities on their haunches; thirdly, at the gorilla; and, last of all, at mankind.

The gorilla, according to Professor Gervais, is the only mammal which agrees with man in having the hair thinner on the back, where it is partly rubbed off, than on the lower surface. This is a most important approach to a marked human peculiarity, and is well worthy of investigation. "I have myself come upon fresh traces of a gorilla's bed on several occasions," says Du Chaillu, "and could see that the male had seated himself with his back against a tree-trunk. In fact, on the back of the male gorilla there is generally a patch on which the hair is worn thin from this position, while the nest-building *Troglodytes calvus*, or bald-headed *nshego*, which constantly sleeps under its leafy shelter on a tree-branch, has this bare place on its side, and in quite a different way." "When I surprised a pair of gorillas," he observes elsewhere, "the male was generally sitting down on a rock or against a tree." Once more, in a third passage he writes, "In both male and female the hair is found worn off the back; but this is only found in very old females. This is occasioned, I suppose, by their resting at night against trees, at whose base they sleep." And when we inquire into the difference between the sexes thus disclosed, we learn that the female and young generally sleep in trees, while the male places himself in the position above described against the trunk.

The gorilla has only very partially acquired the erect position, and probably sits but little in the attitudes common to man. But if a developing anthropoid ape were to grow more and more upright in his carriage, and to lie more and more upon his back and sides, we might naturally expect that the hair upon those portions of his body would grow thinner and thinner, and that the usual characteristics of the mammalia as to dorsal and sternal pilosity would be completely reversed. This is just what has probably happened in the case of man. In proportion as he grew more erect, he must have lain less and less upon his stomach, and more and more upon his back or sides. For fully developed man, with the peculiar set of his neck, face, and limbs, it is almost impossible to rest upon his stomach. On the other hand, all savage races lie far more upon their backs

than even Europeans with their sofas, couches, and easy-chairs; for the natural position of savage man during his lazy hours is to stretch himself on the ground in the sun, with his eyes closed, and with his back propped, where possible, by a slight mound or the wall of his hut. Any person who has lived much amongst negroes or South Sea Islanders must have noticed how constant is this attitude with men, women, and children, at every stray idle moment.

Nor must we forget the peculiar manner in which human mothers must necessarily have carried their infants from a very early period in the development of our race. During the first eighteen months of life the human infant must always be held, or laid, more or less upon its back; and this position will probably tend to check the development of hair upon the dorsal and lateral regions.

Next, let us ask what is the actual distribution of hair upon the body of man. Omitting those portions where the ornamental use of hair has specially preserved it, the most hairy region is generally, so far as my observations go, the fore part of the leg or shin. Obviously this is a region very little likely to come in contact with external objects. On the other hand, the most absolutely hairless places are the palms of the hands and the soles of the feet, after which come the elbows, and at a long interval the knees and knuckles. The back is very hairless, and so are the haunches. But the legs are more hairy than the body, both in front and behind, though less hairy on the calf than on the shin. Now it will be obvious that both by day and night we rest more upon our backs and haunches than upon our legs, the latter being free when we sit down on a chair or bench, doubled in front of us when we squat on the ground (the normal position of savages), and thrown about loosely when we lie down. Especially might we conclude that this would be the case with early races, unembarrassed by the weight of bed-clothes. As for the arms, it is noticeable that they still retain the ordinary mammalian habit in being hairier on the back than on the front; and this also is quite in accordance with our present suggestion, because the same differentiating causes have not worked upon the arm as they work upon the back and legs. The peculiar position of the anterior extremities in man, together with the erect posture, makes the arms come much more frequently into frictional contact with the body or clothing on their inner than on their outer surface. Hair grows most abundantly where there is normally least friction, and *vice versa*. As for the hair which frequently appears upon the chest of robust Europeans and others, I shall return to that point at a later stage. It may be noted, however, that while the first joint of the fingers is hairy, the second joint, answering to the callosity of the gorilla, is generally bare.

As man, then, gradually assumed the erect attitude and the re-

versed habits of sitting and lying down which it necessarily involves, it seems to me that he must have begun to lose the hair upon his back. But such a partial loss will not fully account for his present very hairless condition over the whole body (with trifling exceptions) in the average of all sexes, races, and ages. For this further and complete denudation I think we must agree with Mr. Darwin in invoking the aid of sexual selection, especially when we take into consideration the ornamental and regular character of the hairy adjuncts which man still retains.

In the first place, we have external reasons for believing that sexual selection has produced similar results elsewhere, acting upon a like basis of natural denudation. For among the mandrills and some other monkeys the naked callosities, originally produced, as is here suggested, by physical friction, have been utilised for the display of beautiful pigments; and Mr. Bartlett informed Mr. Darwin that as the animals reach maturity the naked surfaces grow larger in comparison with the size of the body. When we look at the great definiteness and strange colouring of these bare patches we can hardly doubt that they have been subjected to some such selective process.

But if man once began to lose the hair over the whole of his back, shoulders, and haunches, as well as more partially upon his sides, legs, and arms, he would soon present an intermediate half-hairy appearance which is certainly very ludicrous and shabby-looking. Why this middle stage should displease us, it might be rash to guess; yet one may remember that as a rule throughout the mammalia a partially hairless body would be associated with malignancy, disease, and deformity. At any rate, it seems to be the fact that when animals once begin losing their hair, they go on to lose it altogether. One may well believe that among our evolving semi-human ancestors those individuals which had most completely divested themselves of hair, would be the most attractive to their mates; and these would also on the average be those which had most fully adopted the erect attitude with its accompanying alterations of habit. Thus natural selection would go hand in hand with sexual selection (as I believe it always does), those anthropoids which most nearly approached the yet unrealised standard of humanity being most likely to select one another as mates, and their offspring being most likely to survive in the struggle for life with their less anthropoid competitors.<sup>1</sup> It does not seem probable, to me at least, that a naturally hairy species would entirely divest itself of its hair through sexual selection, especially as the first steps of such a process could hardly fail to render it a mongrel-looking and miserable

(1) On the advantages which man or his half-developed ancestor derived from the erect or semi-erect position, see Darwin; *Descent of Man*, p. 53.



creature; but it seems natural enough that if the original impulse was given by a physical denudation, the influence of sexual selection would rapidly strengthen and complete the process. Indeed, if a hairy animal once began losing its hair, the only beauty which it could aim at would be that of a smooth and shiny naked black skin.

Woman is the sex most affected in mankind by sexual selection, as has been often abundantly shown. Hence we should naturally expect the denudation to proceed further in her case than in that of man. Especially among savage and naked races we should conclude that hairlessness on the body would be esteemed a beauty; and we find as a matter of fact that most such races have absolutely smooth and glistening skins. But in Europe, men often develop hair about the chest and legs, though not upon the back and shoulders, while women seldom or never do so. Here we see that the hair reappears in the less differentiated male sex rather than in the more differentiated females, with whom sexual selection has produced greater effects; while it also reappears only on those parts where the original denudating causes do not exert any influence. Similarly, the smooth-bodied negroes, transported to America, and subjected at once to a change of conditions and to circumstances which would render sexual selection impossible as regards the hairlessness of the body, rapidly re-develop hair upon the chest. For we must remember that sexual selection can only act in this direction while a race remains wholly or mainly naked. Clothing, by concealing the greater part of the skin, necessarily confines the selective process to features, complexion, and figure.

As to the poll, beard, whiskers of certain races, we must believe that they are the result of selective preferences acting upon general tendencies derived from earlier ancestors, and, perhaps, aided in the first-mentioned instance by natural selection. The comparative definiteness of these hairy patches, as of the callosities in the monkeys, stamps them at once as of sexual origin. The poll is probably derived by us from some of our anthropoid ancestors, as crests of hair frequently appear upon the heads of the quadrumana. But as man gradually became more erect and less forestine, as he took to haunting open plains and living more in the sunlight, the existence of such a natural covering, as a protection from excessive heat and light upon the head, would doubtless prove of advantage to him; and it might, therefore, very possibly be preserved by natural selection. Certainly it is noticeable that this thick mat of hair occurs in the part of his body which the erect position most exposes to the sunlight, and is thus adaptively analogous to the ridge of hair which runs along the spine or top of the back in many quadrupeds, and which is not visible in any quadrumanous animal that I have examined. The beard also bears marks of

a quadrumanous origin, as Mr. Darwin has shown; but its varying presence or absence in certain races affords us a good clue to the general course of evolution in this particular. For amongst the bearded races a fine and flowing beard is universally admired; while amongst the beardless races stray hairs are carefully eradicated, thus displaying the same aversion to the intermediate or half-hairy state, which, as I suppose, has been mainly instrumental in completely denuding the body of man. Certainly it is a fact that while we can admire a European with a full and handsome development of hair upon the chin and lip, and while we can admire an African or a North American Indian with a smooth and glossy cheek, we turn with dislike from thin and scanty hair either in a European, a negro, or an Asiatic. It seems to me that in every case the general æsthetic feeling of the whole human race is the same; but that in one tribe circumstances have made it easier to produce one type of beauty, while in another tribe other conditions have determined the production of another type. Thus, in a negro, a very black and lustrous skin, clear bright eyes, white teeth, and a general conformity to the normal or average negro features are decidedly pleasant even to Europeans when once the ordinary standard has become familiar;<sup>1</sup> while in a European the same eyes and teeth are admired, but a white skin, a rosy complexion, and moderate conformity to the ideal Aryan type are demanded. Each is alike pretty after its own kind, though naturally the race to which we each ourselves belong, possesses in most cases the greatest attractiveness to each of us individually.

Of course, both in the beard of man, and in the general hairiness of his body, as compared with woman, allowance must be made for that universal tendency of the male to produce extended tegumentary modifications, which, as Mr. Wallace has abundantly shown, depends upon the superior vigour of that sex. Yet the period when the beard first shows itself, and the loss of colour in the hair of both sexes after the reproductive period is past, clearly stamp these modifications as sexual in origin.

It must be remembered also, in accounting for the general loss of hair on both back and front of the body, that the older ancestral heredity would tend to make the chest bare, and the newer acquired habits would tend to produce like results upon the back. "In the adult male of the gorilla," says Du Chaillu, "the chest is bare. In the young males which I kept in captivity it was thinly covered with hair. In the female the mammae have but a slight development and the

(1) The mutilations of the face and other parts, which often make savages so ugly in our eyes, though not in their own, are due, as Mr. Herbert Spencer has shown, not to æsthetic intentions, but to originally subordinative practices, as marks of subjection to a conquering king or race.

breast is bare." All this helps us to see how the first steps in the sexually selective process might have taken place, and also why the trunk is on the whole more denuded than the legs. As for the exceptional fact that the arms are hairier on the back than in front, besides the functional explanation already given, we must recollect that the anthropoid apes have long hair on the outer side of the arms, which has probably left this slight memento of its former existence on the human subject. Eschricht has pointed out the curious fact that alike in man and the higher quadrumana this hair has a convergent direction towards the point of the elbow, both from above and from below.

Finally, it may be noted that the hairless condition of man, though apparently a disadvantage to him, has probably been indirectly instrumental in helping him to attain his present exalted position in the organic scale. For if, as is here suggested, it originally arose from the reactions of the erect attitude, it must have been associated from the first with the most humanlike amongst our ancestors. Again, if it was completed by sexual selection, it must also have been associated with the most æsthetic individuals among the evolving species. And if, as we have seen reason to believe, these two qualities would tend to accompany one another, then this slight relative disadvantage would be pretty constantly correlated with other and greater advantages, physical and intellectual, which enabled the young species to hold its own against other competing organisms. But, granting this, the disadvantage in question would naturally spur on the half-developed ancestors of man to seek such artificial aids in the way of clothing, shelter, and ornament, as would ultimately lead to many of our existing arts. We may class the hairlessness of man, therefore, with such other apparent disadvantages as the helpless infancy of his young, which, by necessitating greater care and affection, indirectly produces new faculties and stronger bonds of union, and ultimately brings about the existence of the family and the tribe or nation. And if we look back at the peculiarities which distinguish placental from im-placental mammals, the mammalia generally from birds, and birds from reptiles, we shall see that in every case exactly similar apparent disadvantages have been mainly instrumental in producing the higher faculties of each successive vertebrate development. Hence it would seem that the hairless condition of man, instead of requiring for its explanation a special intervention of some supernatural agent, is strictly in accordance with a universal principle, which has brought about all the best and highest features of the most advanced animal types through the unaided agency of natural selection.

GRANT ALLEN.

## THE SITUATION IN EGYPT.

IN these days it seems almost impossible to get at the truth of anything in which great financial interests are concerned, and far above all other things of the kind is this the case in Egyptian affairs. Of late Europe has been covered, as by a great cloud, with stories about Egypt, most of which were evident inventions of the financiers. Some of these have, however, been repeated from every quarter with such persistency as to obtain general belief. Sir Stafford Northcote has, in a few words, swept away many of the most boldly concocted stories, such as all those regarding the supersession of the present Khedive through the instrumentality of the Sultan; but there still remain some in regard to which we have no clear explanation. No recent papers having been presented or promised to Parliament, we are left to pick up the facts as we best can, and most of the information we have is of a somewhat negative character.

One thing is clear, that the people of Egypt are always singularly unfortunate. Whoever is up, and whoever is down, they at any rate seem always to go to the wall. The Nubar-Wilson Ministry took office as what must be called a Bondholders' Ministry. Their original platform was the ability of Egypt to pay the debts incurred in her name. Nubar Pasha always avowed that opinion, and Mr. Dicey, who certainly is not hostile to the bondholders, describes Nubar as living in Paris "in close communication with parties by whom Egyptian securities were largely held," and as having been "the first to advise that no demand for a reduction of interest should be entertained" till a searching inquiry was made. It has also been very confidently asserted that Mr. Rivers Wilson, at the outset of his career as Finance Minister, was induced to pledge himself to great financial bodies in Paris, that the full interest should be paid for a certain period at least; and as Sir Stafford Northcote has twice, on different occasions, when the question was directly put to him, pleaded that it was not his business to know about this, and has not denied the truth of the statement, nor has any one else, I have no doubt that it may be taken as substantially correct. Thus it was that being so far compromised, that Ministry began by pledging the last shred of property or credit possessed by Egypt, to add to the already overwhelming debt, so as to enable them to pay the November coupons with the borrowed money; while the salaries of the native officials were left unpaid, and the ordinary expenses of the administration unprovided for—while the people suffered, and famine was rampant in Upper Egypt, to meet which the Government made no serious

attempt. If for these things alone I think that Nubar Pasha was very rightly dismissed.

The events which occurred on that occasion opened the eyes of the European Governments to the serious character of the difficulties which must arise from the attempt to override all native interests for the one object of maintaining for a time the price of Egyptian bonds; and there seems to be no doubt that, owing, I hope and believe, very much to the influence of our Government, the *de-Nubared* Ministry seem latterly to have prepared themselves to throw over the bondholders, to some extent, and to take measures for a fair assessment of taxation, even though that involved a reduction of the interest. But they appear still to have mistaken their position, and to have supposed that they could rule of their own will as the Ministers of a Constitutional Sovereign, without any Constitution, ignoring and contemning the Khedive, from whom alone they derived their authority. They seem, too, to have imagined that the nostrum of flooding the offices with expensive European agency, in total disregard of native feelings and claims, would set all things right. At last the Khedive and his people resisted and they were dismissed. For a too European domination, a purely native rule has been again substituted. And the worst of it is that the influence of the bondholders is really so great, and their power is made to appear so enormous by the falsehoods skilfully circulated, that the Khedive evidently thinks his only chance is to bribe them. So he has promised them great things, and must for the present perform some things at the expense of his people. The Fellahs must again be squeezed; to that it always comes.

There remains the question whether there is any basis of truth in the assertions so constantly made, and which, I suppose, have been believed all over Europe, to the effect that the Khedive had bound himself to the Governments of England and France not to dismiss Mr. Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières without their sanction; and to give them powers which would have wholly taken away all pretence of independence from the ruler of Egypt. This being assumed to be true, we have been told thousands of times by hundreds of organs of public opinion, that the Governments of England and France have been insolently defied and insulted, and the solemn promises and obligations of the Khedive deliberately and impudently broken by the dismissal of his Ministers; and all sorts of terrible things must, it is said, be done—coercion, deposition of the Khedive, and I know not what besides. Even from sources generally the best informed, we have learned that some sort of ultimatum embodying such conditions as have been mentioned, was presented by the two European Governments to the Khedive, and accepted by him upon the 9th March last. We have not yet had any direct contradiction of these statements, but all that has been

said by Sir Stafford Northcote in the House of Commons amounts to an indirect contradiction of them. To begin with, in the debate upon the evening of 13th March, four days after the date of the supposed arrangements, he told the House very distinctly that Mr. Rivers Wilson was merely lent by her Majesty's Government to the Khedive, his services having been sought by the Khedive, and not tendered by the Government of the Queen. Mr. Wilson, he went on to say, went out as the servant of the Khedive, who had the right to dismiss him from his post whenever he thought fit. Her Majesty's Government had no control over Mr. Wilson, who was and still remained perfectly free to take his own course. He added, however, that Mr. Wilson having consulted her Majesty's Government after the dismissal of Nubar Pasha, as to whether he himself should volunteer his resignation, the Government had advised him not to resign, and he said that the Egyptian Ministry itself was in a very unsettled state. It might be possible that some subsequent arrangement should have been made, but again on the 17th April, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he could not tell whether Mr. Rivers Wilson had declined to be dismissed or not, as the Government had received no communication on the subject; for all they knew it might be true, or it might not. Finally, on the 21st April, the Chancellor of the Exchequer being asked again, told the House that Mr. Rivers Wilson had not declined to be dismissed, and therefore had made no communication to her Majesty's Government upon that subject. Of course all this is quite inconsistent with the idea that Mr. Rivers Wilson had become an agent of her Majesty's Government, whom the Khedive had pledged himself not to dismiss without their permission. That part of the story like the rest may be assumed to be quite untrue. We have, in fact, Mr. Rivers Wilson's own statement, published in all the London papers. According to his letter to the Khedive of 6th April, he only claims that the Khedive had on 9th March assured the Governments of Great Britain and France of his intention to abide by his declaration of 28th August, 1878—viz., that he would govern with and by a Council of Ministers; and had said that he would give the most complete and loyal co-operation, under all circumstances, to the Cabinet appointed to carry out the new order of things. The fact seems to be that the Khedive did in some sort promise to govern in a regular way through a Council of Ministers, but never pledged himself to maintain in office particular ministers, whether he approved of their conduct or not.

I think it may be taken as certain that her Majesty's Consul-General in Egypt, Mr. Vivian, wholly disapproved of some of the proceedings of the ministers, and so far as I can gather it seems to be generally understood that the French Consul-General was of the same opinion as Mr. Vivian. In spite of the remonstrances of our

Consul-General, and probably of the French Consul-General also, the ministers went the length of dismissing a large part of the army without paying up the arrears due to the officers and men. It seems to me that the *émeute* which occurred was what I may call the natural result of this action of the ministry, and that it is quite unnecessary to assume that it was got up by the Khedive, in order to account for it. The Khedive may or may not have been a party to what was done; but there is certainly no proof that it was so.

After the differences of opinion which occurred between the Consul-General and Mr. Rivers Wilson, our Government seems to some extent to have taken part with the latter; for, in order to give him the best chance of carrying out his plans, they called Mr. Vivian home, nominally to consult him, but really—it may be judged from what was said—to get him out of the way. The Egyptian Ministry, believing themselves supported by the European Governments, seem to have maintained their attitude of hostility to the Khedive and native notables, a course which Mr. Vivian had deprecated. It may be true that the two European Governments were pressing upon the Khedive some such obligations as those which he is represented as having already accepted, and that the Khedive may have made his move in the game by dismissing the dangerous ministers whom he had entertained as servants, but who had sought to become his masters. At any rate, dismiss them he did.

I quite believe that Sir Stafford Northcote was sincere in telling the House of Commons that when our Government became aware of the real state of things, they wished to look to the good government of the country and to the political objects involved in that good government, rather than to financial considerations. The French Government is no doubt somewhat differently situated; it has more difficulty in dealing with the financiers; but it is just to say that the local agents of France in Egypt do not seem to have made themselves conspicuous by any undue pressure in favour of the financing interests. I have mentioned what has been believed to have been the conduct of the French Consul-General, and there seems no reason to suppose that M. de Blignières did not honestly mind his own business. After Nubar Pasha, Mr. Rivers Wilson, as Finance Minister, seems to have been chiefly responsible for what was done. Mr. Wilson is, I believe, a very clever, accomplished, and amiable man, and no doubt his intentions have been for the best—but nevertheless he seems to have failed in that which he attempted. The fact is that the clever head of a London office of a secondary character may not be fit at once to take the rule of an Oriental country. Mr. Rivers Wilson went to Egypt with that unfortunate pledge to the bondholders about him—and he made the too common mistake of counting his chickens before they were hatched; he made a royal progress through his dominions, and promised great things in the

way of reform ; but meantime the most necessary and immediate reforms were not carried out. The most pressing reform of all, the saving of the people of Upper Egypt from starvation, was not attended to, and the ordinary administration was not put upon an honest and solvent footing. Altogether Mr. Wilson found himself not so strong as he thought, nor so able to make everything right in a day.

I cannot here attempt, and have not sufficient information if I could, to explain the various proceedings of the Egyptian ministry ; but I should like to mention one or two important subjects which it would be well to understand. First, as regards the Daira Lands, on which the new loan has been raised. It must always be remembered that so long ago as the mission of Mr. Cave, the Khedive himself voluntarily yielded up his own Daira lands, and incorporated them, along with the debt attached to them, in the public accounts. It was by Mr. Goschen and his colleague that these Dairas were again put apart, and made a separate trust for the benefit of the bondholders to whom they were pledged. The present concession then is not of the Khedive's own Daira lands, but of those of his family. For administrative purposes I have no doubt that the obtaining of that concession has been a very beneficial result of the labours of the Committee of Inquiry. It is certainly the case that the possession of these lands by the members of the Khedival family, with the privileges of forced labour and the like which they were enabled to obtain, was exceedingly detrimental to the country. Nothing struck me more than this when I visited Egypt. And, therefore, if the lands had been surrendered to be administered by public authority for the benefit of the public and the creditors, the results would have been undoubtedly good. The Khedive now asserts in the most positive manner that he surrendered them with this object only, and distinctly protested against the new loan, which his ministers raised in spite of him. If this is so, I must say I think he is perfectly right, and the ministers were abominably wrong. I never could understand upon what grounds it should be thought desirable to enable these indebted governments to raise new loans for the purpose of paying the interest on the old ones, for that is the real purpose to which the money raised in this way has been applied. If Egypt, or Turkey, or any other country is bankrupt and cannot pay its debts, at all events it is better that it should be forced to cut its coat according to its cloth. To raise new loans to pay the interest on old ones is, it seems to me, a course exactly similar to that followed by the directors of the Glasgow Bank when they paid eleven or twelve per cent. dividend in spite of their insolvency. Then, as regards the mode of dealing with the surrendered lands, the danger seems to be that, since they have been at once pledged to foreign creditors, these creditors may some day claim to take possession, and may oppress the unhappy



fellahs upon the land more than ever the native government could do. I trust that this, at any rate, may be avoided.

I think that the enormous importance of the question of what is called the Mokabileh has never been sufficiently realised. I have before explained in this Review that the Mokabileh arrangement was, as it were, a double operation: that is, first, a large part of the land revenue was capitalised, the money being advanced by, or exacted from, the landholders on the pledge that half the land revenue should be for ever remitted after the year 1886; and, second, a permanent settlement was effected,—a pledge being given that the remaining half of the revenue should not again be altered. This was, in many respects, a most improvident arrangement, especially in regard to the forestalling of one-half the land revenue, which is, after all, the mainstay of the country. As respects the permanent settlement, there is this to be said: that, owing to the former high price of cotton, and the consequent great enhancement, the revenue stood at a very high rate indeed, and there was no great sacrifice of any future augmentation likely to be obtained for a long time to come, now that cotton has gone down. There might have been much reason for rescinding the arrangement on the ground of public necessity soon after it was made; but on the occasion of Mr. Goschen's mission, in 1876, after much inquiry and discussion, the Mokabileh pledges were deliberately and solemnly reaffirmed, and the system has since been fully carried out. I have seen a recent statement, apparently authoritative, making the accumulated payments to the Mokabileh—with interest, I suppose—amount to sixteen millions sterling at the present time. I do not quite see how they can have reached so large a figure as that, but no doubt the amount is very large. Contrast, then, the tenderness shown by the ministry towards the foreign bondholders, who have hitherto been punctually paid, with the wholesale and unblushing breach of faith which they proposed to commit towards the Egyptian landholders by altogether annulling the Mokabileh pledges, upon the faith of which so much has been paid. They proposed to tell the landholders that they are to revert to their old liabilities for full and unlimited land revenue, but are to be compensated for their payments to the Mokabileh by new bonds bearing three per cent. interest, to be paid if they can get it. It does not seem very likely that, where there is so much difficulty in paying the interest of the old bonds, there would be the means of paying interest upon the large amount of new bonds, especially after the Mokabileh receipts have ceased. With reason the Egyptian landholders complain that they have been obliged to borrow at 25 per cent. to make payment to the Mokabileh, and now were to be put off with a promise of three per cent. The Mokabileh has been, and is, a grievous oppression of the poorer landholders, in whose case it

simply means a forcible addition of 50 per cent. to the land revenue of each year. Its exaction should certainly be stopped; but for past payments, allowance should be made on terms more fair than those proposed by Mr. Wilson. The bonds offered are a farce. The amount should be deducted from future payments.

A great reform that has been promised is the cadastral survey and settlement of Egypt, on the most modern and improved Indian model. A first-class Indian settlement officer had been engaged to carry this measure out, and he was to have had an enormous staff. Now, no doubt, this is a very seductive proposal, and, if carried into effect, would be a most admirable and beneficial reform. But there is this to be considered, that, as we well know by Indian experience, a measure of this kind is enormously expensive. The cost of our surveys and settlements in India is to be reckoned by many millions sterling; and even yet I believe that not in any province in India has a regular cadastral survey been fully carried out as the basis of settlement. Till very recently we had been content to survey the country scientifically in large blocks, and to fill in the interior details by a rough native survey. It is only recently that in a few districts a regular cadastral survey has been attempted. We have been for the most part deterred by the increased expense of that process. Now, then, under the bankrupt circumstances of Egypt, with the whole cost of administration reduced to the very lowest minimum, this enormously expensive operation can be carried out, I do not quite see; the expense comes first, the benefit will follow afterwards. In truth, while I was in Egypt, I went a good deal into this land question. The benefit of a regular survey would no doubt be great, but I did not find it was one of the most crying necessities; the holdings seem to be pretty well recognised and established. It was only the revenue rates which were exceedingly elastic, and open to all kinds of surcharges and oppressions. I should take it then that a cadastral survey is rather a benefit to be obtained in prosperous times, than the most immediate necessity. Probably a good many of the larger and richer landholders do not quite pay on their full holdings, but the mass of the people are pretty sufficiently assessed.

It seems to me that we must take our stand on that which Sir Stafford Northcote has so well declared to be our proper object, the good government of Egypt as a political necessity to us, and the fair treatment of the Egyptian people as due to our character for fair dealing and humanity. We must put these objects first, and the claims of the bondholders afterwards. After all, we have now pretty good grounds for arriving at a tolerably correct opinion as to the amount of interest which the country can really pay without oppression, if (and that "if" is most important) the Mokabileh is no longer treated as revenue, but as a deduction from the revenue,

which it clearly is. The Khedive might be made to understand that we do not require him to pay, and shall not think it a merit that he should pay, more than the sum so arrived at. And that done, he may well be asked to devote the remainder of the income of the State to a reasonably good administration without fear of the bondholders, and without a total surrender of his own position.

I quite feel, that despite their vicious origin in financing, many of the bonds are now held by honest and deserving people to whom their entire repudiation would be a terrible hardship. I subjoin an apparently genuine letter addressed to me, in consequence of my action in this matter, because it seems very well to express the feelings of one of the better class of Egyptian bondholders.

“Sir,—I have been a clerk in a railway company and elsewhere for twenty-five years, during which time I have managed to save about £400. I am now getting advanced in years, and my situation is not so secure owing to the preference given, in my profession, to younger men. This makes me anxious to secure an income sufficient to keep life in, and to keep me out of the workhouse. Were I to have invested my savings in English Consols, my income would have been something over £12 per annum, or about 5s. per week, scarcely sufficient to keep life in. I selected Egyptian bonds under the impression that Egypt was a rich and fertile country, producing in great profusion the essential necessities of life, and quite capable of paying the interest I was to receive, if her affairs were properly managed. If I were to sell now, I should lose £60 of my hard-earned savings. My object in writing this is to ask you to make matters no worse than what they are. Your getting up now and again in the House, and lending your influence to those who are interested in defrauding the bondholders, cannot but have a prejudicial effect on the governing power in Egypt. No one advocates the position of the bondholders in the House, and I am at a loss to see why you should go against them by encouraging Egypt to default. If your tenants were to refuse to pay your rents because of some claim their domestic servants might have on them, you would, I think, feel the matter strongly. I feel quite as strongly in the prospect of losing the savings of a lifetime.”

The character of the Egyptian resources is, as my correspondent alleges, such that he might very well put faith in them without the extravagant imprudence shown by many other investors. But, in answer to his case, I would point out as follows:—The Egyptian debt was issued below par; it has been down in recent years to about, I think, 15 or 20, and has never in that time stood near par. My correspondent says if he were to sell now he would lose £60 on his £400 originally invested, so I calculate he must have bought at about 55, the price of the Unified Stock when he wrote being about 47. That price of 55 is probably to the full as high as the average

price paid by present holders, and may be about the sum received by the Egyptian Government on its better placed loans, after deducting the "monstrous cantle" of the financiers. Now, the interest on the Egyptian Unified is nominally 7 per cent., reduced "*temporarily*" to 6 per cent., but as that "*temporary*" will last a very long time, we will call it 6. At that rate my correspondent would really receive, and has been receiving, about 11 per cent. on his money; it will be no great hardship if that is reduced. If 4 per cent. on the bonds were paid, he would still receive upwards of 7 per cent., and even the rate of 3 per cent. on the bonds would give him  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on his money; no very cruel rate if regularly paid. I believe that a reduced rate of interest can be paid, and that in this way the reasonable claims of the bondholders and the fellahs may be reconciled.

The Khedive, in the communication telegraphed by the correspondent of the *Times*, seems to have confined himself to generalities. He seems to consider that he fulfils his declaration of 28 August, 1878, so long as he maintains a native ministry of his own choosing, and governs through them. He has put forth a counter budget, but so far as we have yet seen, that appears to be confined to a general capping of Mr. Rivers Wilson in every particular—that is, always taking less from the people and paying more to the creditors. According to this statement, the only reduction seems to be that the Unified Bondholders are to come down to 5 per cent., while the sinking fund is maintained; and by 1886 all other debts are to be paid off, and the Unified Debt reduced to £39,000,000. Both Mr. Wilson's scheme and that of the Khedive reduce the charges of administration to £3,000,000, but I don't see where provision is made for the Turkish tribute and the English canal shares. Unless the Khedive has found the philosopher's stone, it seems quite impossible that he should carry out what he promises. At the same time I am free to admit that a native administration, conducted with the smallest approach to honesty, could certainly pay much more to the creditors than any improved European administration. I have always said that reform of the administration means reduction of revenue, as well as increase in the expense of the civil administration. Civilised Europeans cannot collect so much revenue by such methods as Orientals do. And both on ground of economy and on that of efficiency, I think it quite a mistake to overburden an Oriental administration with too many European officials. Even in India, where we have a highly-trained, and I think I may confidently say thoroughly honest and reliable European agency ready to our hand, we find it better to employ natives as much as possible; and this is especially so on first taking over new territories, where the administration must necessarily still be somewhat native in character. That is my experience, and it has been large. I have always found many of the native officials very intelligent and

efficient men, and some of them not at all intolerably dishonest ; and I have no doubt that it is so in Egypt, where the people seem to be, for Orientals, a good and tolerably educated people. I have no patience for the easy though common cry which would make every native the acme of everything that is bad, and every European the model of all that is good. That is always the cry of European adventurers wanting employment ; of the class who are now swarming in Cairo. At best a European administration of Egypt must be principally made up of people taken on, honestly it may be, but still experimentally and on trial, for work that is probably new to them. I feel sure that well-selected and supervised natives would do better than most of these men.

The Khedive's new programme seems to be very much founded on the idea of some sort of popular representation of the Egyptian people, and I think that proposal has been treated with undue contempt. It has always seemed to me strange that we who so much pride ourselves on our popular institutions, appear to be the last to recognise anything of the kind in other countries. We seem always inclined to suppose that all over the world the absolute power of a despotic ruler is the natural state of things, though nothing can be more contrary to the fact. Our conduct in India, Turkey, and Egypt seems to have been throughout guided by that belief ; and in Afghanistan, one of the most democratic countries in the world, the greatest danger now seems to be that we imagine, if we can only find or set up a king and come to terms with him, all will be settled. One would have thought our experience of 1841 might have cured us of that delusion. In India the old Hindoo system is one of very limited monarchies, under an aristocratic feudal system, which again is underlaid by a popular system of local government. Wherever Hindoo rule prevailed, or Hindoo institutions had influenced that of the conquerors, we found a system of that kind in existence. The great offices of state were held by an hereditary tenure, independent of the will of the sovereign. The country was parcelled out among clans with their own chiefs and sub-chiefs, and there was often a strong popular element at the bottom of all. Under our system of Residents, which I think an exceedingly bad one, the sovereign has generally been encouraged to monopolise all power ; the object always is that he should rule the people and the Resident should rule him. In purely Mahomedan countries the aristocratic element is wanting, but the rights and interests of the people are guarded by a body of constitutional law under theocratic sanctions, which indigenous rulers seldom venture wholly to set aside. It is under European advice and encouragement that the Sultan has become an autocratic sovereign ; and in my view the great mistake in our present policy in Asiatic Turkey is that we should contemp-

tuously thrust aside the popular institutions which had been conceded, and suggest that all that is required is to find honest and capable administrators, as if such phenomena were plentiful in Turkey. So it is in Egypt—there, as elsewhere, the best Government might be that of very good men exercising large powers; but as most men have faults and weaknesses, I really believe that, so far as a native administration is to be permitted, it might be well that some representation of the feelings and interests of the people should be engrafted on any new system.

The truth is that in Turkey and Egypt and Afghanistan, as in India, our hankering still is after that system of Residents, where the Resident has the reality without the responsibility of power. I think it is a mistake. I have always found that if native states are to be maintained at all, they get on best when they are left alone, with a certain responsibility, and a certain fear before their eyes of that sacred right of rebellion of which the people are deprived when we take the matter in our hand. In my opinion, by far the best managed states in India, and those which are most accepted by the people, are the smaller ones which have no Residents. And I believe the Russians are much wiser than we, in their management of the states in Asia which they have reduced to a protected condition. They have a very effective military control over them, but do not worry them with Residents.

As regards the urgent and immediate question about which so many people are now fussing and agitating themselves, viz. What are England and France to do in this Egyptian crisis? I feel inclined to say, First show that there is any crisis at all that gives us occasion to interfere. So far as we yet know, nothing has happened but that the Khedive has thought proper to dismiss an English servant of his own, whom very recently the Chancellor of the Exchequer told us that he had every right to dismiss if he chose.

The proposal that the Sultan should be encouraged to depose the Khedive, or to alter the succession as a punishment, by his mere fiat, thereby reannexing Egypt to the direct rule of the Porte, is too monstrous for serious discussion. Is it for this that the autonomy of Egypt has been so long settled and guaranteed by Europe? Is it for this that the order of succession has been settled on a rational footing, accepted by Europe, and paid for in hard cash?

There is probably nothing for us to do but that which it seems generally now believed that we must confine ourselves to doing, viz. to say to the Khedive—Very well, you are master in your own house, and entitled to do as you like there; but remember we cannot allow Egypt to fall into anarchy and ruin, and if you fail to govern decently, and the fellahs are more and more oppressed, then we must intervene.

GEORGE CAMPBELL.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE grave national lessons contained in the events of the past month are so plain that those who run may read them. On the mere political difficulties of the Government it is unnecessary to lay particular stress. Unfortunately, the troubles of her Majesty's Ministers are also the troubles of the nation, and if there is one fact on which, at the present moment, any congratulation is possible, it is not that the clouds round the Cabinet are thickening, but that there are signs of returning common-sense throughout the country. It is therefore from no partizan point of view that we prefer to regard the action which is supposed to indicate the formal and final secession of Lord Derby from the Conservative ranks. Such satisfaction as the event may yield should come less from the probability that it portends the loss of one or two important ministerial seats in Lancashire, than from the knowledge that it marks, with all the emphasis of personality, the antithesis between the conduct of the Government and the sober judgment which has not yet entirely deserted every section of the English people. Lord Derby has long been a typically representative man of a certain kind. In the Cabinet formed five years ago, he symbolized the presence of cautious moderation; just as Mr. Cross did that of business-like aptitude, or as Mr. W. H. Smith's promotion to Cabinet dignity a couple of years since reflected the power and influence of a rich, rising, industrious middle class. At the time, Lord Derby's withdrawal from the Government did not visibly or immediately affect the position of his colleagues. The English public was in one of its most irrationally reckless humours, and was wildly dancing to the music, for which the proverbial necessity of payment has now arrived. Coinciding with this alteration in the national mood, Lord Derby's refusal publicly to occupy any longer the position of an official patron of societies which exist for the organization of the forces of the new Democratic Toryism, has already produced much effect, and will shortly be fruitful in more substantial results. It matters very little whether Mr. Bright's anticipations are fulfilled, and a dissolution does or does not take place this year. It is difficult to see how a new accusation of unconstitutional conduct can be made good against the Government on the plea that they are bound by precedent to appeal to the country without delay. As a matter of fact the alleged precedent lacks the binding force of absolute uniformity; nor perhaps could the value of the gravamen of Mr. Bright's charge be better illustrated than by the figure of a firm which, as a matter of practice, usually



taking up its bills a month before they are payable and getting the advantage of the rebate, allows them in a particular instance to run on till they are legally due. In permitting Parliament to expire by effusion of time, as it will do in the spring of 1881, the Prime Minister is simply following the example of Lord Palmerston's Government which took office in 1859. If these tactics are considered expedient by ministers, it would be unjust and unreasonable to deny their full right to adopt them. The Cabinet has now reached a point where it is plain that it has lost the secret of success. Whatever it puts its hand to fails, and when this process has once set in, no Parliamentary strategy is likely to arrest its development.

These are considerations that concern her Majesty's Ministers rather than the country which they rule, and it is with facts and deductions of the widest and deepest national interest that we shall now chiefly deal. Two events in particular have occurred, each of them supplementing the other, of which one shows in an accentuated and compressed form the perils of the policy of ubiquitous intermeddling, while the other is suggestive of some arguments that seem absolutely conclusive against the new international departure. On the 8th of this month the House of Lords pronounced the decision endorsing the judgment of a Scotch divisional court, that those persons who, acting as trustees for others, held shares in the City of Glasgow Bank laboured under precisely the same liability as ordinary shareholders. No new principle of law was thus laid down, and the judgment of the peers on appeal on the present occasion simply reaffirmed that which had been authoritatively stated by their predecessors. But the judges would have shown a stony insensibility to grave moral injustice, and pitiable personal suffering, if they had not accompanied their deliverance with a few words deploring the existing state of the law. It was of course the strict business of Mr. Muir and his fellow trustees to have acquainted themselves with the full extent of their liability—which they might have done—when they consented to act as fiduciaries, and with the precise position of the bank, which perhaps they could not have done. The neglect, however, of two tasks, one possible, the other impossible, does not dispose of the fact that, as matters are, those who hold shares under marriage settlements, or any other similar document, are parties to a unilateral, and therefore so far an iniquitous contract. The arrangement has no element of reciprocity about it: the trustees have no claim to the participation in profits, while there opens up to them a vista of infinite responsibility for losses. But this is only a part of the question. It is clear that while the law continues in its present state, it presents inducements and facilities to frauds of a practically heinous character



—those practised by cunning upon simplicity and ignorance. So long as the legislature ordains that those who really possess the shares which others ostensibly hold, shall or may be exempt from any pecuniary risk, it is as certain that dupes will be found as it is that knaves will not cease to exist. Here then is a circumstance which imperatively demands reform, and which is closely connected with a great subject that the Government have already recognised as ripe for legislation—the deficiencies of the Bankruptcy Law. No one has yet denied that our greatness exists on a basis of commercial prosperity. Without credit commerce would be impossible; buyers and sellers, producers and consumers, must possess mutual confidence at home, and must have the good faith of those with whom they are brought into contact abroad. It is the business of the law to place as many impediments as possible in the way of fraudulent transactions, and it is for this reason that such a measure as the Lord Chancellor has introduced was an absolute necessity. The only question is whether that measure is adequate for the purpose which it aims at accomplishing.

But is it possible, in the present temper of the ministerial policy, and with the difficulties which at present block the ministerial path, for these matters to receive the attention they deserve, essential though that attention is, not merely to justice and good government, but to the future of our national well-being? The state of things that still exists in Egypt is the most significant commentary which we could have on the chances of time being found to give heed to those truths which are necessary for our salvation. Of all the obstacles that now confront the Government in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America—*quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?*—none is more formidable, none more prolific with the seeds of possible disaster, than the *flasco* in Egypt. It is not to be guilty of exaggeration to say that the record of all our recent relations with that country is the history of a blunder. Our motives have been as little creditable as our action has been unfortunate. The influences of the Stock Exchange, which have entered so largely and systematically into the new Imperialism, presided over the purchase of the Canal shares. We went, as Mr. Bright put it the other day, into partnership with France, and the arrangement had as little heroic about it as any other commercial negotiation. Months passed, and gradually our connection with the country became closer, and our interest in it more keen. The object of this interest and the guarantee of this connection were alike unworthy. The Egyptian peasants died of starvation and bled under the lash of the taxgatherer's whip. Impost after impost was heaped upon their backs till at last they paid not less than £2 a head; in other words, as it has been calculated, five times the taxes paid by Bengalees, with the addition of the rental paid

to the landlords. Of these iniquitous exactions seven-tenths went to the foreign bondholders, and the other three-tenths to the Sultan, to the British Government for the Suez Canal transactions, and to the European minister of the Khedive. Such was the character of the partnership into which France and England entered. The interference thus initiated went just far enough to uphold, but not to reform, the scandalous system under which Egypt had been administered for years. France upheld it from a fear lest its sudden collapse should precipitate a grave financial crisis in Paris. England joined France because British Imperialism wished to show that without its sanction France could do nothing. Things went on from bad to worse, and Ismail Pasha created an *emeute* not by way of a diversion, but as a hint to Europe that he intended to manage his affairs in his own fashion. The hint was not taken, and the French and English Governments addressed a reprimand to the Khedive, couched in the language that the suzerain naturally uses to the vassal. After this it was impossible to deny the fact that Egypt was practically under an Anglo-French protectorate. It was denied all the same, and now that the Khedive has registered his decision in the most unmistakable manner to tolerate foreign interference no longer, it has been denied again.

We are not now concerned to discuss the question whether, if it had been desirable to do so, we could have asserted ourselves in Egypt in a more heroic fashion. It is, indeed, probable or possible, that at the time when nearly two years ago Germany suggested an English occupation of the Delta, France might have been diplomatically "squared." But it is as certain as anything can be, that had some temporary arrangement of the kind been made, it would have been the earnest of a crop of grave troubles in the future. Nor, is it less certain that if we were to attempt now anything in the nature of a joint occupation of Egypt with France, we should be exposing our friendly relations with that country to a serious risk. There would inevitably be a collision between two rival systems of administration and their representatives, which might conceivably be the harbinger of national misunderstandings. But even supposing such a scheme were practicable, is there anything to show that it is, we do not say justifiable, but expedient? Unless we base our interference in Egypt, which it cannot be imagined for one moment we should do, on the broad ground of the moral duty imposed on England of ameliorating the condition of the oppressed Fellaheen, where is the reason for such interference to be found? It will be answered first, in the necessity of establishing our influence in the country by getting the Khedive—for the bondholders are never mentioned—out of his difficulties; secondly, in the paramount importance of anticipating the intervention of any other European Power. As

regards the former of these points, it is a pure assumption that—admitted our interposition would secure the solvency of Ismail Pasha—our influence in Egypt would be greater than it is now, or the Khedive would be more disposed to regard himself as our dependant. As a matter of fact, the result which would probably be realised, is the exact contrary of this. The Khedive, once he had planted his feet on the firm ground of guaranteed liabilities, elate with a sense of new-born independence, would rejoice to think that he had got the better of his self-elected protector. An Oriental prince in a state of actual and potential bankruptcy, is much more likely to hold himself deferentially and submissively towards a European power, than one whom a full exchequer makes master of the situation. Thus we come to the alternative hypothesis—that if England does not make good her hold in Egypt, some other power, probably France, will. Now, this is the sort of argument which has been repeatedly adduced on a variety of cognate occasions, in the course of the last two or three years. It is the argument which would compel us to establish ourselves on every available inch of soil, all the world over, in which it seemed possible that any other power might gain an interest too. It is the argument which was reiterated again and again, in the case of our relations with Russia in Asia, and which if it had been paid heed to would have plunged us long before this in a costly and bloody war. It is an argument, which if it be good for anything, would justify a policy of aggression and annexation at all times, and in all quarters of the globe. But is there any reason to be apprehensive of France or any other European State taking an unfair advantage of us in Egypt? It is enough to say that if the reply is to be given in the affirmative, it involves not only a gratuitous charge of treachery against France, but a loud-voiced proclamation of the impotence of our own diplomacy. Besides, what is our interest in Egypt? It is limited exclusively to the high road to India—the Suez Canal. Can it be seriously pretended that there is any nation in Europe which would run the risk of a war with England, simply to intercept us from the great artificial water-way.

But it may be said there is yet a more excellent way by which both France and England may secure the practical advantage of interference in Egypt without garrisoning Cairo, or blockading Alexandria. France and England are admonished in some quarters that, always acting together, they should place pressure upon the Porte to depose the Khedive without delay. Those who counsel this course take it for granted, first, that the Sultan would be willing to send a military force—for it would need a force—to teach Ismail Pasha the practical significance of the hand-writing on the wall; secondly, that when he had learned this lesson, it would be possible to insure his act-

ing on it promptly. There is one sufficient objection to this proposal. It entirely ignores and contradicts the policy which both England and France have endeavoured to carry out in their dealings with Egypt for a number of years. This policy has been to make Egypt as independent of Turkey as possible, to introduce the Porte as little as may be into the management of its affairs, and generally to pave the way for a separation between the two portions of the Turkish Empire. It has, in fact, been a steady policy of disintegration, and for this, it is now suggested, that one of unification should be substituted.

The real course to pursue is perfectly clear and simple. It is to let Egypt severely alone. This is the true policy not of England singly, or of France singly, but of both together, and as such it is recognised by the less heated and more far-seeing portion of the press in both countries. Facts, wrote the *Journal des Debats*, in an article of signal sagacity a few days ago, have again and again demonstrated to us the hopelessness of all attempts to make Mahometan States take the true path of progress or enter into the moral or political comity of European nations. Persistence in these attempts can only result in a disastrous compromise of European interests and dignity. The experience of generations, crowned by the attempt which was made two or three years ago to establish a Parliamentary *régime* at Constantinople, reminds us that Oriental princes have an ineradicable incapacity of submitting to that form of constitutional government which we have attempted to force upon the Khedive. The experiment has been, as it was destined to be, a failure. What then? Granted that it is an admirable idea to act as missionaries in the cause of parliamentary and constitutional rule to the nations who sit in darkness; is it a matter of such vital concern to Europe after all that there should be a Parliament "at Constantinople, or Cabul, or Cairo"? We ought to see that the thing is impossible. The true course is simple: "The most effective chastisement we can inflict upon the Khedive, because he has shown to us that his ways are not as our ways, is to leave him to himself." Thus left he will revolve in a vicious circle, till at last he will fall head forwards to the ground. He counts upon new European credulity to give him pecuniary assistance. Let these expectations be disappointed and he will be helpless, and being helpless he will become the most pliant of princes and the most manageable of vassals.

In addition to the international troubles which the Government have created for themselves and the country, there are those of a purely domestic character, which may be classed under the two heads, financial and industrial. The true character of Sir Stafford Northcote's Budget is now pretty well understood by the country

at large, and for further elucidation of its qualities and consequences we may wait till Mr. Gladstone has delivered in the House of Commons his expected criticism. The only thing to be regretted is that this criticism was not delivered on the evening on which the Budget was introduced. It so happened that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, rising to speak at an unusually early hour, dispatched his business with comparative brevity, and left the opposition a good eighty minutes before the dinner hour, when Mr. Gladstone could have commanded a House full to overflowing. A grave and circumstantial attack made under these conditions upon Conservative finance would have produced a profound effect both upon the House of Commons and the country, and it is difficult to believe that it was not a mistake in parliamentary tactics to let the opportunity pass by. Pending Mr. Gladstone's demonstration of the cowardice as well as the corruptness of Sir Stafford Northcote's system, these points may be mentioned. As matters are, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made no provision whatever for that Afghan War, of which it must be always remembered we have only witnessed one episode. In the short Session before Christmas the Government admitted that the whole expenses of the war could not fairly be charged to India, yet of the proportion in which they are to be distributed between the two countries we have heard not a word. Again, in the case of the Zulu War, a million and a half was voted at the beginning of the Session for its expenses. The Cape and Natal newspapers, however, estimate the cost as varying from six to twelve millions, and recollecting that the expedition to Abyssinia involved an expenditure of about ten millions we should have imagined that the largest of these sums was considerably inside the mark. Thus there can be no doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has seriously under-estimated his liabilities. On the other hand, there is reason to believe that he has taken far too sanguine a view of the revenue. It will be found when the receipts of the current quarter come to be compared with those of the corresponding quarter of last year that they display a very considerable falling off. But this is not all. The rise in customs, it must be recollected, just before the Budget was introduced, was entirely artificial, and was due only to the rush to clear tea. Had it not been for this, that department of the revenue would have exhibited a steady decline; and since this cause of increase is no longer operative, it is a decline which we must as a matter of fact anticipate. Again, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer talks of the elasticity of the revenue, does he give their full weight to the great features in the present condition of the country? If we have a good harvest, if there is no great outbreak of cattle plague, if there are no more great failures consequent on the general depression of trade and

manufacture, then all will be well. Without forecasting the two first of these hypotheses, the light which the general state of agriculture throws upon the calculations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is of the most sinister kind. Lord Beaconsfield, in his remarks on Lord Huntly's motion a few weeks ago, refrained from the attempt to reassure his hearers. His advice, in fact, to desponding agriculturists was the same as that which he gave eight months ago to the Greeks—have patience. The monition, it may be confidently believed, will ensure the same sequel in the one case as in the other. All the evidence which is available at the present moment shows that agriculture is not merely stationary, but that it is retrograding, while the fall of wages in the poorest districts of England steadily continues.

When we come to the momentous question of trade and industry we pass from a scene of stagnation to one of conflict. In mining and manufacturing England we hear still of nothing but strikes and rumours of strikes. At the present moment it would be rash to predict the issue of that which is incomparably the greatest of these struggles—that in the Durham colliery district. We observe with great regret that an example of most inauspicious omen has been set here by those who should have served as models of moderation—the masters. Among the Durham miners arbitration has prevailed, and has been loyally adhered to, by the men during the last eight or nine years. They were both willing and anxious to resort to it now. Nor, indeed, was the principle of arbitration, though in an exceedingly qualified shape, resisted by the masters. But there was one difference between them; whereas the former claimed that the whole question of reduction of wages should be submitted to arbitrators, the latter demanded that a preliminary reduction should be made at once, and that only the balance should be arbitrated on. To demand this was to distrust and invalidate the whole principle of arbitration; and it is the more surprising, as well as deplorable, that the masters should have done this, seeing that several of the most eminent of their number gave valuable testimony in favour of arbitration, both in a rising and falling market, before the coal committee of 1873. We cannot be astonished that the miners should have decided by an enormous majority at the ballot of Saturday, April 19, not to consent to arbitration upon the imperfect and mutilated terms proposed by the employers.

From the dangers of social disturbance we remain happily free. The English masses, the most law-abiding and long-suffering in the world, continue ignorant of that coercive legislation which, wherever it is tried, proves the most effective mode of organizing sedition. It is impossible to look at the contemporary condition of Russia without a shudder. A scoundrel fires half a dozen shots at a monarch, and immediately a Government that has hitherto prided

itself on its progressive character, makes a bound back to political barbarism. The greater portion of the immense empire held by the Czar is now being administered on principles identical with those which underlie the government of shapeless masses of men, ere yet a definite society can exist. A widespread conspiracy exists, and the only mode of dealing with it which presents itself to the alarmed mind as practicable is a resort to the most undisguised forms of terrorism and brute force. All the great provinces of Russia are now placed under military law. Imprisonment, exile to Siberia, the abolition of the last semblance of a free press, these are sentences which may not only be threatened, but which may be carried into effect, without any trial and after no preliminary inquiry of any kind. The horrors of such a *régime* involve a great deal more than meets the ear. Where there are incarceration and transportation without trial, there will there also be torture and death. The suspected emissaries and instruments of the revolution will disappear as mysteriously as the officers and executors of the law. This is not government; it is not even repression. It is the collapse of all government; it is the guaranteed failure to attain the very ends which repression is designed to accomplish. And it would be wrong to say that this reign of terror is introduced as a last resort. Other alternatives have not been fairly tried. The present Emperor of Russia is a humane and enlightened man, and his name is associated with a measure of the highest humanity and the largest wisdom. More legislation conceived in that vein was wanted; further instalments of constitutional reform have been untried. The empire discloses the existence of a great intestine malady, and the sole method of treatment which presents itself is a policy which will resolve society in Russia into the atoms out of which it sprung. Nor is it only the essential iniquity and the incredible unwisdom of the course, which is so deeply to be lamented. The spectacle of a Russian Government proceeding by wise, cool and courageous legislation to extirpate a social and political pest would have commanded the sympathies and admiration of Europe, and would have secured an ally of immense value in the creation of a solid and powerful body of public opinion. But a Russian Government which, however menacing the evil, resorts to a policy of panic, incurs a risk of alienating from itself the good-will of enlightened observers throughout the world.

*April 25, 1879.*



THE

# FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

---

No. CL. NEW SERIES.—JUNE 1, 1879.

---

## PAUPERISM AND TERRITORIALISM.

Our agricultural situation has become so unsatisfactory, and is causing so much uneasiness, that one may now hope for a fuller discussion of our land system than it has yet received. It is unlike that of any other people. Its primary aim appears to be the maintenance of certain social and political arrangements, and this has imposed upon our agriculture an economical condition quite peculiar to ourselves. Hitherto the commercial relations of the external world to the United Kingdom have rather aided than obstructed the peculiar action of the system. Recent developments of commerce, however, appear to be now reaching a point at which the general economy of the world is bringing a pressure not before felt to bear upon the special economy of our English agriculture, and this seems to be overpowering it.

The most marked feature of our land system, that which first strikes the eye and most arrests attention, is its territorialism. In this country estates are territories. One might have supposed that wealth would have had the very opposite effect—that it would have greatly increased, instead of greatly diminishing, the number of the proprietors of land. Its action here is anomalous. How is this to be accounted for? Of course only by a cause which, while it is peculiar to ourselves, is also of sufficient reach and potency to have produced here so mighty, so unnatural, and so universal an effect. We used to be told that this territorialism was quite unavoidable, because here land was so dear that only the very wealthy could afford to purchase it; neither custom nor legislation was in any degree accountable for it; it was the direct result of an irresistible economical law. This explanation, however, was only an assumption of the very reverse of the facts of the case. A personal investigation, carried on now for nine years, in Switzerland, the Channel Islands, and France; in the agriculture of all of which the most prominent feature is the



general division of the land into small properties, has proved to me that in all of them the price of agricultural land is higher than that of land of equal natural fertility in this country, and not unfrequently twice as high. If, therefore, its price here is the cause of the existence of our territorial system, it can only be so because it is so low as to make it easy for one man to purchase a great deal of land, not at all because it is so high as to put the land out of the reach of all except the very rich. And the fact is that our lowness of price does act in this way here, but only after some other cause has incapacitated the class which elsewhere competes for land from competing for it in this country.

The natural purchasers of land are those in any country who are familiar with its cultivation, and are able by their own labour to extract from it their support. These are its natural purchasers, because they have stronger motives for purchasing it, and can turn it to better account than other people. This is precisely what we see everywhere in the world except in this country. There must, therefore, be amongst us some exceptional cause, working widely and powerfully, which disables those who ought to be the most eager and numerous purchasers of land from doing here what they would be doing were they living anywhere else. Had some English labourers fifty years ago emigrated to Switzerland, to the Channel Islands, or to France, we cannot but suppose that their descendants would now be possessed of land in their new home, notwithstanding its high price; and, undeterred by that consideration, would be bidding for it like their neighbours whenever it might be in the market. Had, however, the supposed emigrants remained in this country, their descendants would not now be possessed of land here; and, notwithstanding its comparative cheapness here, would not be in a position to bid for it, even if parcels that might be easily transferred, and were of dimensions suitable to their requirements, happened to be in the market. Whence this difference?

It can be explained by the action of our poor-laws. It would be difficult to exaggerate the social and economical effects of these laws. Their administration is a department of the State, and the main concern of every parish in the kingdom. No Englishman is exempt from the effects of their action, either as a contributor to, or as an actual or prospective recipient of, the fund of many millions of pounds they annually levy. They are never far from the thoughts of all the wages-receiving part of the community, and more than all the other enactments of the statute-book together influence and shape their lives. And no wonder, for these laws have, in effect, been saying for three hundred years to the working classes that there is no reason why they should toil, and deny themselves, and save for the purpose of acquiring property in land, or why they

should trouble themselves about the removal of difficulties that have been put, or have sprung up, in the way of their acquiring it. The country will always look after them, and when they are in need will support them out of the produce of the land and from the property of the rich. There is no reason why they should not spend in eating and drinking, or in vice, or in any way they please, all their earnings, for when sickness, or accident, or old age overtake them, they have only to apply to the administrators of the law, and they will be relieved. If wages cannot be earned, they will be supported without wages; or, if wages are insufficient, their insufficiency will be made up. Medical attendance will be provided for them; when needed, board and lodging will be found for them; and when they shall no longer need the provision the public has made for them during life, they will be buried at the public expense. There is, perhaps, no other instance in the history of the world of a legislature having in this direct and effective manner discredited thrift, and to so great an extent founded the social fabric on the direct and inevitable demoralisation of the greater part of the community.

We have become so familiar with the state of things these laws have brought about amongst us, that, though we find nothing of the kind anywhere else, it gives us no disquietude. We accept it as though it belonged as much to the course of nature as our November fogs and March east winds. This state of things, however, is precisely a main element of our existing situation, which cannot be examined to any purpose unless we observe the action and trace out the consequences of these laws. Generally what first strikes the foreigner who visits this country, from whichever side of the Atlantic he may come, is the enormous disparity of conditions amongst us. The longer he may stay amongst us, the more strongly he appears to become impressed with this English fact. He is astonished at its vastness, and shocked at its effects. It forms the most prominent of his remembrances, and is what he dwells most upon when speaking of what he saw in England. And at last it almost seems as if we ourselves were beginning to think that there is something in our neighbours' comments on this subject—that such unexampled wealth and luxury at the summit, and such an unexampled amount of destitution at the base of society, constitute a state of things which in good times we cannot contemplate with satisfaction, and which might not be capable of bearing the strain of bad times.

This vast disparity of conditions, which has now come to be the very governing fact of English life, is ultimately referable to our poor-laws. For three centuries they have been demonstrating to the labouring class that they can exist without property; wages, with the rate to fall back upon on any failure of wages, or on any

emergency of any kind, being sufficient for all the requirements of life; and the labouring class have found that it is so. They have, therefore, gradually ceased to make any effort to acquire, and even to have so much as a thought about acquiring, property in land. They have become content to see themselves practically shut off from its acquisition by laws which permitted the settling and charging of land, and the piling up of obstacles in the way of its transfer. Had there been no poor-law here, then, instead of the creation of difficulties that have the effect of hindering the peasantry from obtaining land, whatever difficulties might have existed would, as has been done elsewhere, have been removed for the very purpose of facilitating their obtaining it. A country must have a peasantry, and the peasantry must have the means of living; and if there had been no poor-law, the possession of land would have been the only general, secure, and permanent means of enabling them to live, for that is not to be found under all the circumstances of life, and the ever-recurring contingencies of seasons and trade, in wages. Had the requisite facilities existed in this country, and had the peasantry felt the necessity, as they must have done when it was a question of life and death, of availing themselves of these facilities, the land would then have been divided on this side of the silver streak in much the same fashion as on the other side. Property would have been largely diffused, and we should not have had so many vast territories cultivated by labourers so propertyless and so pauperised. The law, while it was providing for every one a means of support other than the possession of land, and which would be secure to every one without hard work and hard saving, obstructed its acquisition by the peasantry with almost insuperable difficulties. These arrangements naturally blossomed on the one hand into pauperism, and on the other into territorialism. It was a legislative process, involving several steps, for constructing and filling in every neighbourhood one enormous reservoir at the expense of several thousand small ones. The single large one was filled only by the emptying of the multitudinous small ones, and they were emptied for that purpose only.

The demonstration of the impossibility of peasant proprietorship in this country, by reason of the alleged greater dearness of land here than elsewhere, having been demonstrated to be nothing more than a false assumption, the advocates of territorialism based on pauperism have taken up new ground. The fashionable argument now is, Look at the ignorance, the laborious lives, the greed for land of the French peasantry; is that the kind of thing you wish to force upon merry England? Some, of course, will at once prefer vastly merry England, though it might, perhaps, be hard to point out what grounds there are now for mirthfulness amongst its peasantry.

Those, however, who demur to the comparison, or rather to its implied conclusion, will have to show why they desire, so unpatriotically and perversely, that our English labourers should be morally and intellectually as good men, and should have as much command of the resources of life, as the French peasantry. My reasons would be founded on such facts as I have recorded in my volumes on Swiss subjects, and in an article in *Fraser's Magazine*, for August, 1877, on Swiss Mountaineering, and in three articles that have appeared in this Review on Land Tenure in the Channel Islands, and on the Peasants of the Limagne.<sup>1</sup> For the most recent confirmatory evidence I would refer to Mr. G. G. Richardson's lately published work on *The Corn and Cattle Producing Districts of France*.<sup>2</sup> His object is to give a detailed account of the agriculture of all the old provinces of the north, the west, and the centre of France taken separately. He makes them, in preference to the modern departments, the divisions of his work, because their boundaries generally coincided with certain distinctly marked natural peculiarities, which have always affected their respective agricultural methods and productions. Mr. Richardson is no particular friend of peasant proprietorship; it is the operations of agriculture that are carried on with much capital and on a large scale that attract his attention, and which he undertakes to describe, as being most likely to interest English readers. Still, it is not possible to write upon French agriculture without making some mention of the labours and of the position of its five millions of peasant proprietors, and the incidental notices of them we meet with in his pages are often valuable. In speaking of the way in which in a commune in Franche Comté the peasants, not one of whom has cows enough to enable him to make cheese at home, have combined their means for the establishment of a common cheese-factory, he says, "If there is a bit of land to be sold, there is not a man in the place but has money enough in his pocket to buy it" (p. 434). Of the peasant proprietors of a part of Poitou he says, "Perhaps in no part of Europe can there be found a people more before the world in all their wants" (p. 254).

The attempt to show the superiority of our English system by insisting on the ignorance of foreign peasant proprietors will only raise, in those who have some actual acquaintance with them, a smile at the ignorance or hardihood of those who make such allegations. They ought to be able to show the extent, the character, and the evil consequences of this ignorance. For instance, that it unfits the Swiss and French peasant proprietors for exercising the franchise for the good of their respective countries; or that society in those countries is endangered by their ignorance, and that their disfran-

(1) *Fortnightly Review* for January, 1876; and for November and December, 1878.

(2) Published by Messrs. Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, 1878.

chisement would be a gain for its order and stability. It might be asked, What is the form of rudeness or barbarism this ignorance has given rise to? In what way has it lowered those who are affected by it in the scale of civilisation? Has it enfeebled their moral tone? Has it made them drunken, or unthrifty, or dishonest, or unkindly, or bad citizens, or bad neighbours, or bad husbands, or bad fathers? What is the relation of life with respect to which it has exercised on them a demoralising effect? But what is now wanted is not so much an absolute as a comparative statement of the point, for the comparison is between the peasant proprietors who dispose of the destinies of Switzerland and France and our own agricultural labourers, whom hitherto we have been afraid of trusting with the franchise, and who, if they were admitted to it to-day, would probably only exercise it for the purpose of obtaining, if possible, a larger measure of out-door relief. For such attempts, however, no one could blame them, because the State has for ages been inculcating upon them the fact that in this country wages supplemented by the rate, or rather the rate supplemented by wages, for the rate is the last and only unfailing resort, are their means of support.

The next point is the laboriousness of their lives. This is merely an *argumentum ad ignaviam*. See how hard these Swiss and French peasants work! Would you like to work as hard? There is, however, one particular about this hard work of theirs which, while it is certain, does not render the contemplation of it distressing. It does not prevent their being the good and self-respecting kind of people that all who go among them and get acquainted with them find them to be; it is satisfactory evidence that their moral tone has not been debased and enfeebled. Much the same view is to be taken of what is called their greed for land, when that is rightly interpreted. It means just what the laboriousness of their lives means. The welfare of a man's family, its position in life, its command of the resources of life, are all entirely dependent on his own exertions, and the only direction in which these exertions can be turned to account is the acquisition of land, which fairly, wisely, and humanely has been opened to him. It is, then, in no way discreditable to him that he has no disposition to spare himself in his efforts to secure what will be not merely an increase in comfort, but even a positive advance in civilisation, to his family. This is a greatly ennobling greed. What higher praise can be bestowed on men than that for so worthy, so high an object, they are ready to spend and to be spent? That is the true explanation of their greed for land. It sums up and contains in its single self more substance than has often been expanded into a volume of panegyric. No wonder that they are willing to pay for land what to some of us appears an exorbitant price. It exactly takes in their minds the place of the thoughts that our

agricultural labourers have about out-door relief. Just as the English labourer leans upon and trusts to that, so does the Swiss or French peasant trust to the acquisition, by his own hard work, of land for maintaining himself and his family, and—this does not enter into the thoughts of the English labourer—for raising them in life. How immeasurable is the difference between the two! The thought and trust of the one is degrading, and implies that all hope has been abandoned, or rather that it never existed even in the blessed days of youth and the vigour of fresh manhood; while the so-called greed of the other, if regard be had to its purpose and effect, is an elevating pursuit, always cheered by the hope and promise of solid and continuous advance.

If we set aside names, and look at the things as they are in themselves, we shall find a close approximation and a substantial resemblance between the condition of English agricultural labourers and that of predial slaves. In organized communities the possession of property is almost essential to the exercise of freedom, and in all stages of civilisation the possession of a home is quite essential to the education of humanity. But our land system has made the agricultural labourer almost entirely propertyless, and of all people upon earth, from the most barbarous to the most civilised, the most homeless. As to property, he possesses no more of all that this world is capable of supplying to man, than a very scanty store of poor clothing and a very few pieces of rickety furniture. Could a slave possess less? As to what stands for his home, it is a tenement often unfit for human habitation, from which, such as it is, he may at any moment be ejected at the will, even through the exercise of the merest caprice, of his employer, and for the improvement of which—often very much needed—he has not the means, or, should he have the means, is precluded from the motive for using them because, under existing circumstances, he would only be improving another man's property. If this can be called a home, it can only be in the sense in which the tenement occupied by a slave may be regarded as a home to him. There is something exclusive and sacred in the idea of a home, because without it the true life of the family is impossible. If there are such things as natural rights, the home is as much the right of the family as life is of the individual. And how can that be a home, especially among the poorer classes, which does not belong to the family, but to another, who, at the promptings of his supposed interest, or of any kind of impulse on which he may choose to act, may expel the family from it? The most potent and the most abiding of all educating influences is the ever-present desire to secure a home, and to make it in all respects as good a dwelling-place as possible for the family. That a man should impose on himself hard work and hard saving in order to spend for

this purpose is an exhibition of morality and religion in their most genuine form. To have a home which is no home, which cannot be regarded with these feelings, which kills these motives, which cannot be employed for these purposes, which deprives a man of this training, which interdicts the education nature intended for him, is to be in a position which—although it is what English law has created for millions of Britons and on British soil—has upon its face something of the badge of slavery, not a little of its character, and a great deal of its effects. And, again, the breaking up of these homes, such as they are, and the compulsory seclusion of their remaining members in the poor-house, when the man's life-work on other people's land is done, is not unlike the provision a community might make for those who, in their working days, had been the slaves of the public. The sacredness of the home, and its absolute necessity for anything at all worthy of the name of human life, is consistently to the last entirely ignored, and the only point considered is, How shall those who can no longer labour be kept alive at as little cost as possible? Shocking as this is, still it is quite unavoidable under our land system. And no one is to blame for it, but those who, being able to understand how it was brought about, and how other countries have been saved from it, not only make no efforts to remove impolitic and even inhuman restrictions, but would, perhaps, strenuously resist any efforts which had that object. It is precisely this moral element in the question which makes its discussion so difficult. To the minds of some this is what invests it with a high political and human interest, while others can only see in it a proposal for disarranging the existing social order.

At present the obstacles in the way of legislative remedies are quite insuperable. Our polity and society largely, and our agriculture entirely, rest on this system. Pauperism is an essential foundation of the mighty superstructure. Of course pauperism is the condition not of those only who are at this day in the receipt of public relief, but quite as much both of those who have received it in the past, and of those who are looking forward to receiving it in the future. It is the condition of all who through the effects of legislation have been made propertyless, and who have become content with being in this state, and who are, therefore, looking to what the law provides for them, as their sure and, when wages fail, their only resource against all the ills of life. It is a moral as well as an economical condition, or rather a condition of demoralisation as well as of destitution. Unless the peasantry of this country had generally been reduced to this state, and they could have been reduced to it only by a law, such as our poor-law, acting irresistibly on the whole body for centuries, our territorialism would have been impossible. It became possible by the extinction among the peasantry of the desire to possess land,

and even of the moral and intellectual qualifications were it given to them for turning it to account.

It may also be worth observing how much of what is peculiar to English society is directly due to this territorialism. What is called London society—the assemblage in London of a great number of extremely wealthy persons—could have no existence without it. Ten thousand acres require for their cultivation six hundred men. It is because our system has pauperised those six hundred men that those ten thousand acres have come into the hands of a single proprietor. And there have been a great many other six hundreds that have been in the same way reduced to the same state, and with the same result. There is a sense, then, in which their contributions to the splendours of the London season are far from inconsiderable, for each six hundred, through having accepted pauperism for themselves, have enabled one territorial magnate to take part in the great assemblage. This, too, on the other hand, is the reason why in our country towns society is on so sadly low a level, so poor, and so unembellished. If the land around those towns were divided into a large number of small and of moderately sized estates, the owners of these estates, not being rich enough to live part of the year in London, would find their amusements in the neighbouring town, and would contribute more to its society than all its professional men, who necessarily at present constitute almost the entire society of the place. And in the rural parish, even if it have a resident magnate—which, however, from the extent of territories and other causes is becoming the exception—there has pretty generally been brought about an extinction of society in every form.

Nothing need be said about the manner in which and the degree to which territorialism has affected our political condition. How the wealth of a country is distributed among its population has ever been a main factor in the modification of its political constitution; and amongst ourselves it has not had fewer effects of this kind than amongst other people. To the same cause must be attributed the form and character of our agriculture—that, for instance, it is carried on on what would elsewhere be considered large farms, not by their owners, but by tenants; that these tenants have no motive for sinking capital in the improvement of the land; that the work is done by labourers whose only direct interest in their work is to do as little and get as much as possible; that corn and meat have become almost the only possible products of such a system.<sup>1</sup>

(1) Of all the topics of self-laudation we resort to, perhaps the one we insist on with the greatest frequency and the greatest complacency is the number and vast aggregate amount of our charities. But, if the reason of this English fact were understood, the frequency of the reference, and the complacency out of which it arises, would be somewhat diminished. Our charities are numerous because they are needed, and they are needed because there is in this country one of the richest nations in the world side



All this, it is true, having been brought about by legislation, may be undone, it is easy to say so, by legislation. But he must have more hopefulness in his composition than experience of human affairs, who expects our legislature to enact what would involve a reconstruction of the form society has grown into amongst us, the diminution of the political influence of the most powerful class in the country, and the remoulding of our agricultural system, with which no one of the three parties immediately concerned in it is dissatisfied—not the territorial magnate whom it places in a grand position, nor the tenant to whom it gives many times as much land to cultivate as his capital would allow of his purchasing and cultivating, nor even the pauperised labourer, who, now that he has been morally and intellectually subdued to his sad position, is quieted by having the rate to fall back upon in all emergencies.

Still no land system, any more than anything else in human affairs, is eternal or unchangeable. Ours has been a growth of time; and, like all that have gone before it, as new disturbing causes arise to act upon it, will in time decay. And now, when we find it in an unsatisfactory condition, we naturally ask whether any such causes are beginning to come into operation and are adversely affecting it? If any such can be detected, we wish to have them defined and their action traced out. We wish to know how far the reach of their action may go? whether it can be resisted? and whether its effects will be permanent? Our territorialism has necessitated the universal adoption amongst us of the most costly of all the methods by which the land of a country can now be cultivated. The occupier has to pay rent, tithe, and poor-rate. He has to recover the interest of his capital and the value of his time, and this off land which the nature of his tenure prohibits him from improving. All this has to be done with hired labour, which, compared with that of his foreign competitors, is neither efficient nor cheap, nor likely to become either more efficient or less costly. Emigration has long been draining off all our best agricultural hands, for only the young and vigorous-minded emigrate; and education is now aggravating the drain by enlarging the horizon of the labourer, and showing to him the evils of his condition and a way for escaping from them. I have resided in the same parish for the last thirty-eight years, and during that period of time not half-a-dozen of those who were born and brought up in it have remained there, the first wish of those who have any energy or knowledge being, as they themselves express it, "to get off the land." These are very disabling weights for our agri-

by side with the most helplessly destitute nation in the world. Under, therefore, existing circumstances there are other reasons, besides those of humanity, why the rich nation should help the poor nation. What is peculiar in our charities arises out of what is peculiar in our English system.

culture to work under. They were, however, not very sensibly felt under our old protective system, nor, indeed, in the early days of free trade. Several years were required for making the foreign cultivator, a class generally slow to learn and slow to move, acquainted with the fact that if he would set himself to produce what was wanted in this country, and was not being produced here as cheaply as he might produce it, it would be to his advantage. Changes had to be effected in ideas and practices. In many cases this would require a new generation; for the new trade a new organization was necessary; classes of middle-men had to be created, channels of transport to be provided, and the demonstrations of experience had at the same time to be established. But now at last, with respect to almost every kind of minor produce—though, indeed, their aggregates are very far from small—all this has been effected and we are getting from abroad a very large proportion of our potatoes, vegetables, fruit, eggs, poultry, butter, cheese, &c. Under our costly system, which obliges the largely unimproved land, neither efficiently nor cheaply worked, to support three orders of men, in these products, which require a great deal of labour and attention, it is quite impossible for us to compete with those who produce them from their own land with their own labour. Such competition is now seen to be hopeless, and is ceasing to be made. With respect to them the demonstration is complete.

One of the first agronomic effects of free trade was to impose on us the necessity of enlarging our farms with the view of saving expenses in labour and buildings, and to favour the employment of machinery, which all meant the concentration of attention on corn and meat. Everything then was seen to depend on corn and meat. But corn and meat are subject to the same laws as potatoes and eggs. The only difference is that they demand for their production a greater breadth of land, a larger investment of capital, and more capacious means of transport. A longer time, therefore, was required for bringing the outside world to undertake and create the supply. This, however, is now being effected, if it be not already completed. In California and Oregon, and in the illimitable north-west of the United States, in Canada, in South Australia and Tasmania, and in India—for the present I omit Europe—wheat is now being largely and systematically produced for the English market. A beginning had to be made. During that period the amount of our home crop still regulated the market price here. The beginning then made has rapidly grown into such dimensions, that these vast regions are now capable of supplying us with any amount of wheat that we can possibly want. One obvious result of this is that the wheat of the United States, whence the chief supply comes, must regulate the price of the English market, irrespective of the amount of our home production.

This American dominion over our market having now been established can never be cast off. The breadth of wheat land in the United States and the intelligence and energy of the people render its maintenance a certainty. They can now sell wheat here at twenty shillings a sack; should improvements in the means of transport enable them to lay down the sack here at fifteen shillings, our home growers must descend to that figure. But no one supposes that our system admits of wheat being grown at twenty shillings. The production, then, of wheat here will probably be soon in the same position as that of potatoes, eggs, &c. Twelve years ago, while inquiring into these matters in the United States, I was told by the farmers of New England and Virginia that the cheapness of Western and of Californian wheat was extinguishing the cultivation of wheat all along their Atlantic seaboard. What is to prevent its having the same effect on this side of the Atlantic?

At the present moment, indeed, the price of butchers' meat appears to be the only prop of English agriculture. But is even that to be depended on? It is more difficult to organize a trade of meat and of live cattle and sheep than of corn; but is there anything in the nature of the difficulties that must render them insuperable? During the tour in the United States and Canada to which I have just referred, I saw at Toronto a train of fat cattle in trucks belonging to an Illinois Railway Company. I could not understand why Canada should be importing fat cattle. I therefore looked up the man in charge of the cattle, and asked him what was their history and destination. I learnt from him that the beasts in the trucks before me had been bred in Texas, then driven up through the prairie States to Missouri, where there was an unsaleable surplus of maize, had there been fatted, and were then being transported by train through Canada for consumption at New York. This transaction carried them alive over about three thousand miles. It would be a similar combination if cattle bred at the foot of the Ural mountains on the steppes of Southern Russia were to be driven to Hungary, where there is a surplus of corn that cannot be exported; there fatted; and then sent on by rail to Hamburg or Ostend for the London market. But we shall not have to wait for a large influx of foreign meat till the slow-going European has formed the combinations necessary for a trade of this kind across our Continent. The quick-witted American having already brought his cattle across his own continent down to the Atlantic seaboard, has begun to organize arrangements for transporting them to Liverpool. Texas and the long line of prairie States can breed cattle in numbers that, as far as our wants go, would be illimitable. It is the want of new outlets for their surplus production of this kind that is stimulating their ingenuity to organize the trade with this

country. Along the prairies, a thousand miles wide, and between two and three thousand miles from north to south, where before the advent of the white man nature kept in admirable condition incalculable millions of buffalo, I have seen their successors, the white men's cattle, fattening at midwinter, without any shelter, on the autumn dried grasses, the uncut hay, of the boundless plain. The Canadian dominion, many times as large as this country, can do in the same way a great deal. So can the Virginias, alone as large as France. So can several other contiguous large States. All these vast regions are practically and in every sense as much the feeding ground of the English market as Scotland or Kent. All that is required is the organization of the trade, and it is being organized; and the provision of sufficient means of transport, and that is now being created. There seems to be no reason why what has been done for eggs, fruit, vegetables, butter, cheese, and lastly for corn, should not be done for dead and live meat. Everything requires a certain time. It may have required twenty years to organize fully the trade with France in eggs; but at last it was done on the scale required. It may have required thirty years to organize with America the trade in corn; but that, too, has now been done, and on the scale required. It may require forty years to do as much for cattle and sheep; but that now appears to be in a fair way of accomplishment. A beginning has at all events been made successfully with pork, which the Americans are now selling here at fourpence a pound, a price which has made it unprofitable for us to raise pork on our system. A successful trade in mutton and beef would be so enormous in its magnitude, that there are no efforts that will not be made to work out its organization. What has been done during the three last years is merely an experiment to see how the thing may best be worked.

Butchers' meat, then, is the last support of our agriculture, and should the assaults that are now being made upon it greatly reduce its price, there will be nothing left to fall back upon. Even a very considerable reduction of rents, which, however, would imply almost a social revolution, would not meet the difficulty. If they were entirely remitted on the inferior lands, cultivation would not be possible on our system. Many such farms in the eastern counties have already been thrown up by their old tenants, and new tenants cannot be found for them, and this while it is only the price of corn that has been reduced to the American level. If the same fate be awaiting the price of meat a general collapse of English farming seems inevitable.

This collapse, should it come, will be brought about not because the at present inexhaustible land of America is cheaper than land is here. That will not be the reason, because in this country land

is cheaper than it is in Holland, Normandy, and Brittany. Still we cannot compete with them in their produce. We do not send to them potatoes, vegetables, eggs, poultry, fruit, butter, cheese, &c. If cheap land were decisive of the matter, we ought to be able to turn back upon them the stream of these articles which is ever flowing to us. What causes our inability to compete with both alike, is the inferiority for purposes of cheap production of our system of land tenure: that it is which decides the methods, the spirit, the cost, and the products of our cultivation. While we are suffering much, and dreading worse things to come, how is our nearest neighbour faring? We hear no complaints from France. The contrast is complete. There agriculture is flourishing. Its five millions of cultivators are making and saving money, and not far from all of them have investments in Government securities. And these savings, effected, too, let us remember, from agriculture, have made France, perhaps, the very richest country in the world. It is the prosperity of its agriculture which enables it to bear its enormous burdens. Why this enormous difference? I believe it is because in France the land is pretty generally divided into moderately sized and small properties, and for the most part cultivated by the hands of the owner. This is the system on which the prosperity of French agriculture is founded, and which enables it to beat us out of our own market in those kinds of produce in which the French cultivators can compete with us. And it is the same system, only on a continental scale, and applied to the two main necessities of life, corn and meat, which is beating us in North America. You may start from the Atlantic seaboard, say from New York, and follow the setting sun for two thousand miles through the great Lake States, and across the Prairies to Omaha, and you will find the country much enclosed, and pretty generally taken up with holdings of from eighty to a hundred acres, each cultivated for the most part by the labour of the owner and his family. The cultivation, as might be expected, is rude, but the outgoings are small, very small indeed. The farmer, being owner, has no rent to pay. He has no ever-recurring Saturday night payments to make. The family is maintained chiefly by home produce. The surplus it is that is sold. If there are bad harvests, or prices are very low, the meaning is not ruin, but only fewer amusements and fewer luxuries. The two regions, then, the one beyond the Channel and the other beyond the Atlantic, which are now assailing English agriculture, are both fighting it with the same weapon—the labour of the proprietor. This is the cheapest method of agriculture, while ours is the dearest. As to the question of how far the issue has already been worked out, and how much further it will be carried, every man will have his own opinion.

We have nothing to fear from Dantzig or Odessa wheat. The system which supplies the wheat shipped at those ports is not that of France and of America. They, in fact, are suffering, and will suffer, from American competition, only not to such a degree as we shall. Much of the depression now weighing heavily on them has its origin on the other side of the Atlantic. As long as they could supply us at a price which was remunerative to them under their system, the opening of our ports greatly benefited them. But now that the American, that is the cheaper, system has got the effective command of the market, their trade in corn, which is their chief production, has received almost a death blow. The loss to them will be enormous, and will have to be computed by yearly millions. Nor will they be able to find any remedy, for the changes in the methods of cultivation which the circumstances of the day demand of them imply social and economical changes that would require powers of apprehension and of self-adaptation which do not belong to their backward and stagnant condition. The loss of price inflicted on every corn-grower in Europe at a time when, through the rise in wages, the cost of production has been increasing, is one very efficient cause of the present long-continued and general stagnation of business, and possibly too, of the apparent appreciation of gold.

On the supposition, then, that the above diagnosis of our present situation is correct, the question we are called upon to consider is, What will be the result here amongst ourselves? Prophecy is not demonstration; but the probability of prophecies is in proportion to the certainty and completeness of the grounds on which they rest. Besides, it is only common-sense prudence to foresee and provide against what is coming. If our tenant and hired labour system cannot compete with the French and American system of cultivation by the hands of the owner, their system will eventually in some fashion or other have to be adopted over a large portion of the surface of this country. That means a great deal. It means that general economical causes, which under free trade are now bringing their almost fully developed force to bear on our local and special agricultural economy, will have overpowered it; and that, furthermore, means the overthrow of our territorialism, and together with it of our agricultural pauperism. For if facilities effectively equal to, though not necessarily of the same kind as, those which exist in France should here be granted to the labourer for acquiring land, the one sufficient and the only unfailing means for the support of that class, then there will be no more need for a poor-law to keep alive the English, than there is for one to keep alive the French peasantry. And together with English agricultural pauperism will disappear its twin-sister, English territorialism.

But how can so mighty a change, which will involve so great a social revolution, ever be brought about? The particular steps by which it will be effected are in truth unimaginable. There is, however, no occasion to draw for them upon imagination. Necessity has no laws, and is the mother of invention. *Fata viam invenient*. Destiny will work out its own accomplishment. It may be supposed that a territorial magnate, if he cannot let his land, will, as he cannot cultivate it, be glad to sell it. But that does not give us a glimpse of a direct and workable solution, for there is at present no class in this country that could buy land and cultivate it themselves. The ability to do this has been utterly and universally extinguished amongst us by our system. If a district of England were by some process of mighty magic transferred to France or to America, it would be bought for the purpose of being cultivated by the hands of its purchasers. Amongst these competitors of ours that would be the natural, almost the only, thing to do with it. But here neither the existing occupiers nor the existing labourers are in the least degree fitted for anything of this kind. The farmer, except occasionally on small dairy farms with but little arable land, is as unfit for manual labour as the landlord or the tradesman; and the mental condition into which the poor-laws have brought the labourer have most signally disqualified him intellectually and morally for independent cultivation. If the land were given him he could make nothing of it. This is something too serious to be called a *reductio ad absurdum*; it is the Nemesis of a false and inhuman system.

A conceivable alternative to cultivation by the proprietor is that of joint-stock cultivation on a large scale, with a capital of, perhaps, not less than £200,000. Mr. Richardson, in the work already referred to, mentions two concerns of this kind in Germany, one at Salzmünde and the other at Oschersleben, of which he tells us that "the sum invested in each can hardly amount to less than £400,000." And Mr. James Howard, late Member of Parliament for Bedford, whose agricultural implement works at Bedford are known all over the world, in his work on *Continental Farming and Peasantry*, mentions something of the same kind in the neighbourhood of Cologne. In parts also of California, and of the great north-west of the United States, where hired labour can be obtained, joint-stock cultivation is being introduced. As this method of farming would require abundance of costly machinery and entirely new buildings, which would involve permanent investment on a very large scale, it would be necessary that the land should belong to the shareholders. So far this would imply the abatement of individual territorialism. Even were it to introduce a new kind of territorialism, it would be one that would have in it nothing invidious or exclusive, for it would be equally open to all, even down

to the agricultural labourer, to purchase the shares of the concern. But no very great portion of the country could ever be cultivated in this fashion.

We have seen how economical causes now in operation may overthrow our land system. So also may increased knowledge. There is no other great question that has been so little discussed, about which the public knows so little, and in which it seems to take it for granted that it has so little concern. This ignorance and indifference we may suppose will not last for ever. It has been already noticed in this article that all the three classes connected with the land are content that things should remain as they are. What is really surprising is that the towns should know and care so little about the matter. The home market is the most valuable to the manufacturer, and the market of the neighbourhood is everything to the tradesman; and there is nothing that would so much enlarge the home market for the towns of production, and the market of the neighbourhood for the towns of distribution, as the doubling, or, as we may say, looking at France, as the quadrupling of the surrounding agricultural population, and that by a process which would substitute for paupers self-respecting, self-supporting, landowning cultivators. Although our manufacturers and tradesmen have not yet discovered that they have this rich mine in their neighbourhood, are we to suppose that, when the discovery has been made, and they have become convinced of its value, they will not make some efforts to have it opened?

F. BARRHAM ZINCKE,



## CHESTERFIELD'S LETTERS TO HIS SON.

"THE eagle," said one of the wisest of men, "does not nestle securely in the very bosom of Jove, the day on which he has quarrelled with a beetle." How much more serious, however, is the predicament of the royal bird, if he has offended, not a humble insect, but an animal of a far higher order. This was the misfortune which befell Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield. Justly or unjustly, for we know but one side of the story, he roused against him the anger of the "literary whale"<sup>1</sup> of his generation, and his memory suffers from it unto this day, in spite of the partial reparation which was made by his assailant. It is not my intention in the following paper to attempt to do anything towards rehabilitating Chesterfield, who had unquestionably his fair share of faults. Persons who set to work to rehabilitate damaged reputations are peculiarly apt to be attacked by a dangerous form of the *rabies biographica*, and to confound truth and falsehood, right and wrong, in their headlong advocacy. The object of the following pages is far more humble, and purely practical. Mr. Leslie Stephen, not the least eminent of an eminent family, has adopted, or almost adopted, what appears to me a monstrously unjust criticism of Dr. Johnson's upon a work of Chesterfield's, which ought in my judgment to be far more generally read than it is; and I am anxious, by recalling to the attention of some readers of this Review what really was the essential part of the teaching of Chesterfield, to do something towards making the study of his *Letters to his Son* what I think they ought to be, a regular portion of the education of every Englishman who is likely to enter public life tolerably early. Before going further, however, it is absolutely necessary to admit, without any qualifications, that the book has some very grave defects. These fall for the most part under three heads.

1st. There are a number of coarse expressions and allusions thinly scattered through the four volumes which are, although they occur in all the light literature of last century, not the less repugnant to modern eyes and ears.

2nd. The whole book is pitched, so to speak, an octave too low, if not for the day in which it was written, at least for that in which we have the good fortune to live. A man of the world, as shrewd

(1) Peter Pindar prophesied very truly of Boswell—

"Triumphant thou thro' Time's vast gulf shalt sail,  
The pilot of our literary whale."

as Chesterfield, would in the year 1879 have grasped the truth that to make an assured and honourable success in politics now, a character ought to be broader and deeper than that on the building up of which he laboured so assiduously. There must be just as much shrewdness and knowledge of the world as ever, in the composition of the politician who is to play at the gold table and to win; but there must be, in an age when great masses are to be moved, a good deal more enthusiasm, a good deal more sympathy, and a good deal more poetry.

3rd. There are a great variety of passages which inculcate what we have happily learned to think a most detestable morality. Chesterfield drew a broad distinction between ordinary dissipation and the gallantry which the practice of his times authorised in all continental countries, and to this topic he recurs with provoking frequency.

If I were engaged in estimating his character, it would be necessary to linger on this disagreeable subject, and to inquire what weight ought to be given to it in balancing his faults against his virtues. I cannot, however, make it too clear that I am not engaged in estimating his character. That was done very well more than a generation ago by the late Lord Stanhope in his History, and by Mr. Hayward in an Essay, which has been reprinted.

My object is, as I have said, a purely practical one. To examine, namely, how far his *Letters to his Son* can be made useful at the present day, and it fortunately happens that all his bad morality may, for that particular purpose, be left on one side. "No one," says an eminent legal writer, "however feloniously disposed, can run away with an acre of land," and it is not less certain that no young gentleman on his grand tour, however lax may be his principles, could form in every capital which he entered those intimate relations with ladies of position and reputation which Chesterfield is always pressing upon his son; although he would find it but too easy, if he had a turn that way, to indulge in those grosser forms of vice which Chesterfield so justly and so continually reprobates. The society in which Philip Stanhope moved is as dead as the Heptarchy, and we may treat the objectionable passages in the *Letters* as simply non-existent.

As to how far Chesterfield's views with regard to the women of his own day squared with the facts, it is beside my purpose to inquire; but certain it is that any one who, professing to be a man of the world, repeated these views as the result of his own observations on good society in the times in which we live, would, *ipso facto*, prove that he usurped a title to which he had no shadow of claim, and drew his conclusions, not from the experience of life, but either from books or from his own extremely foolish inner consciousness. Whatever may

have been the case a hundred and fifty years ago, there cannot be the slightest doubt that any young man of adequate merit and position, who was properly introduced, and would take a little trouble, could now pass from capital to capital, living everywhere in the society of women who would do all for his manners that Chesterfield desired, and more even for his mind and his morals than they did for his manners.

Before we can estimate Chesterfield's educational ideas correctly we must understand what he proposed to effect. He proposed, then, to make his natural son, Philip Stanhope,—a youth of fair, but not shining abilities, cursed by nature with curiously ungainly manners,—an all-accomplished man, worthy to stand in the first rank of politics, now as a Member of the House of Commons, now as a negotiator at foreign courts, now as the confidential adviser of the heir to the throne, and now as Secretary of State. He wished to do this in an age when personal influences were much more powerful than they are in our day, when the people had very little power, when the idea of a Frenchman's fighting for "*la patrie*" as he would fight for "*l'honneur du Roi*" seemed wildly preposterous; when a letter in Germany might be returned if only one of twenty titles were omitted in the address—in short, in that world of minute etiquette and endless formalities which M. Taine has so well described in the first volume of his book on the *Ancien Régime* and the *Revolution*.

This being the problem to be solved, it is clear that importance would have to be attached to many things which are nowadays, to borrow a happy German-student phrase, "colossally unimportant;" while on the other hand, the world having progressed much since the middle of last century, many things now of great moment could not be expected to find a place. On the whole, however, the reader will, it is to be hoped, think that there is much more of what is permanently valuable than is usually supposed in the book to which it is sought to direct attention.

What then was Chesterfield's system? And, first, what was its foundation? Its foundation, startling as the reply may appear to those who know his book only by hearsay, was morality and religion, *as their author understood them*. If we turn, for example, to Letter cxx.<sup>1</sup> we find the following passage: "As to the moral virtues, I say nothing to you; they speak best for themselves, nor can I suspect that they want any recommendation with you; I will, therefore, only assure you that, without them, you would be most unhappy."

Again, in Letter cxxiii., after some observations about know-

(1) My references are throughout not to Lord Stanhope's edition, which, although the best, is scarce and dear, but to the third edition (1774), which is more easily procured.

ledge, we read: "For I never mention to you the two much greater points of religion and morality, because I cannot possibly suspect you, as to either of them."

Again, in Letter cxxxii. occur these words:

"Pray let no quibbles of lawyers, no refinements of casuists, break into the plain notions of right and wrong, which every man's right reason and plain common sense suggest to him. To do as you would be done by, is the plain, sure, and undisputed rule of morality and justice. Stick to that; and be convinced that whatever breaks into it, in any degree, however speciously it may be turned, and however puzzling it may be to answer it, is, notwithstanding, false in itself, unjust, and criminal."

Looking on to Letter clxviii., we find this:

"While you were a child, I endeavoured to form your heart habitually to virtue and honour, before your understanding was capable of showing you their beauty and utility. Those principles, which you then got, like your grammar rules, only by rote, are now, I am persuaded, fixed and confirmed by reason. . . . I have therefore, since you have had the use of reason, never written to you upon those subjects: they speak best for themselves; and I should, now, just as soon think of warning you gravely not to fall into the dirt or the fire, as into dishonour or vice."

Nothing could exceed Chesterfield's horror and detestation of the ribald talk against morality, which was a not unnatural though calamitous result of the revolt against superstition, which formed so important a part of the history of the last century. On that subject he writes with a passion which he shows about hardly anything else.

Thus in Letter exciii. he says:

"I hope in God, and I verily believe, that you want no moral virtue. But the possession of all the moral virtues, *in actu primo*, as the logicians call it, is not sufficient; you must have them in *actu secundo* too: nay, that is not sufficient neither; you must have the reputation of them also. Your character in the world must be built upon that solid foundation, or it will soon fall, and upon your own head. You cannot therefore be too careful, too nice, too scrupulous, in establishing this character at first, upon which your whole depends. Let no conversation, no example, no fashion, no *bon mot*, no silly desire of seeming to be above what most knaves, and many fools, call prejudices, ever tempt you to avow, excuse, extenuate, or laugh at the least breach of morality; but show upon all occasions, and take all occasions to show, a detestation and abhorrence of it."

With regard to religion he observes in Letter clxxx.:

"Putting moral virtues at the highest, and religion at the lowest, religion must be allowed to be a collateral security, at least to virtue; and every prudent man will sooner trust to two securities than to one."

As to the form of his religion, Chesterfield began by being a bigoted, but soon became a very moderate member of the Church of England, extending his tolerance even to the Roman Communion, which, associated as it was with opposition to the rising spirit of inquiry and with the exiled dynasty, he heartily disliked both as

a philosopher and a politician; but to whose priests and services he directs his son to show on all occasions proper respect.

On this foundation Chesterfield desired to raise a solid superstructure of knowledge, beginning, of course, with what we now call the "three r's," and the subjects usually taught to children before they go to school. A large portion of the first volume is filled with letters upon the elements of political geography and history, generally written in French, which was carefully taught to young Stanhope from the very first. Of what we now call Physical Geography there is of course not a trace.

Soon Latin and Greek were added, and made the staple of education for some years under competent private tutors; and later, at Westminster, "Classical knowledge," that is, Greek and Latin, the boy is told, while still only about twelve years of age, "is absolutely necessary for everybody, because everybody has agreed to think and to call it so." . . . "You are by this time, I hope, pretty near master of both, so that a small part of the day dedicated to them, for two years more, will make you perfect in that study."

It would be an error, however, to conclude from this passage, that the writer did not attach importance to the study of the classics for their own sake. Many of his judgments about particular authors, as for instance where he speaks with contempt of the Greek epigrams, some of which are amongst the most exquisite of human compositions, are sufficiently absurd. For the Letters and *De Oratore* of Cicero, however, for the History of Thucydides, and the Orations of Demosthenes, he had evidently a genuine admiration; and again and again enjoins their study. Classical reading, indeed, filled a larger place in young Stanhope's training than a wise man, who had in view the same objects as Chesterfield, would now allow it to do in the case of his son. It must not be forgotten, however, that in the middle of the last century the importance of Greek and Latin works, weighed against the other literary productions of the human mind, was enormously greater than it is now. German literature cannot be said to have existed, and the number of works of a high order, either in French or English, was trifling compared with what we now enjoy. Numerous passages could be cited to prove that Chesterfield had an eye for what was best in the writings of his contemporaries. Pope, Atterbury, Hume, Robertson, and Voltaire, receive indifferently the tribute of his respect for the excellence of their style and other merits, while he uses the very strongest language to describe the impression made upon him by the eloquence of Bolingbroke, of whom he has left a portrait worthy to be set side by side with some of Clarendon's. He was anxious that Philip Stanhope should write good Latin, and has some exceedingly sensible remarks

upon that subject in Letter cxxxii., in which he contrasts the Latin of a gentleman with the "Latin of a pedant who has probably read more bad authors than good." Were he alive now, he would doubtless be very indifferent to his son's writing Latin at all. Circumstances, however, are entirely changed. In Chesterfield's time, not only did learned men still correspond not unfrequently in Latin, but the power of writing good Latin might at any moment have been useful to a man who, like Philip Stanhope, was intended to spend much of his life in countries where he would be brought into contact with men who used Latin as the language of business, which indeed was the case to a considerable extent in Hungary up to 1835, and in Croatia even later. Then, again, a great many branches of human knowledge, of which the elements should be mastered during the course of a general education, did not then, at least for educational purposes, exist. Chesterfield speaks with respect of geometry and astronomy, desiring that his son should know their elements; but for him, as for most of his contemporaries, natural science had no being. To him a man who occupied himself with it was as frivolous a trifler as one "who contemplates the dress, not the characters, of the company he kept."

Now all this is altered. So able a person would have seen clearly that in an age when material progress has become such an important feature in the life of all civilised nations, when everything seeks for a scientific basis, it would be worse than futile for one who aspired to be in the forefront of politics, not to have at least a general acquaintance with, and a sympathy for, one of the most important, if not indeed for the time the most important, portion of human activity. He is always urging his son to be the "*omnis homo*," the universal man, and to describe any man by such a name at the present day, to whom natural science was a sealed book, would be merely a bad joke. We may then be certain that as he could not increase the number of minutes in an hour, and as an important part of his system was to allow some six hours a day for work, and to devote the rest to exercise and pleasure, he would have suppressed the writing of Latin, and indeed every accomplishment, however elegant, which did not go to build up his ideal of a statesman fully equipped for his work in the world.

A good foundation of Greek and Latin having been laid, Chesterfield's next care was to make his pupil perfect in German, Italian, and French, so that he might employ all those languages with ease, and become acquainted with what his father considered to be best in their literatures. Chesterfield had the greatest respect for the French authors of the age of Louis Quatorze: of the Italians he recommended especially Tasso and Ariosto, giving the preference to the second. His literary criticisms, in short, were the criticisms of most

intelligent men in that age; sensible enough as far as they went, but rarely going below the surface of things. Woe be, it has been well said, unto the nineteenth century in so far as it denies the eighteenth, for it generally loses itself in dreams if it does. In criticism, however, it has certainly a right to boast that it is "far better than its fathers."

Young Stanhope, who, when he left England, already knew a good deal of French, was sent abroad with the Rev. Mr. Harte, a man of some learning, and the author, at a somewhat later period, of a *Life of Gustavus Adolphus*. They travelled by Heidelberg to Switzerland, and settled first at Leipzig, where, in addition to working at Latin and Greek, Stanhope heard lectures on public law and the law of the Holy Roman Empire, studied the principal European treaties, and began to make himself acquainted with the best works on modern history, then a task far less formidable than it would be at present.

His father kept urging him to increase his knowledge of geography, "wearing out his maps by constant reference to them." He insisted, as I have said, on a perfect knowledge of French, German, and Italian, but treated Spanish rather as a counsel of perfection, pretty much as he would, if writing now, have treated Russian.

He advised his son to make himself acquainted with all the circumstances of every country in which he might be; to question every man whom he came across about the things which he knew best, and liked most to talk—old soldiers about war and fortification, priests about the ceremonies and tenets of their respective churches, diplomatists, and more especially the Venetian and Sardinian agents (of whom Chesterfield had a particularly high opinion), about political affairs. Nor did the old statesman fall into the error which has been too common amongst diplomatists, of thinking that commercial matters were only fit for the attention of consuls. On the contrary, he pressed Philip Stanhope to learn as much as he could about them, by reading whatever he could find that was really good, from Huet's treatise on the commerce of the ancients to Sir Josiah Child's little book, which might be called, he says, the *Grammar of Commerce*. It is true that the mind of the teacher was full of the illusions that beset the world before the days of Adam Smith; but this did not arise from any carelessness or want of interest in the subject.

During his son's residence at Leipzig, Chesterfield's exhortations to the cultivation of good manners became incessant. These exhortations—which occupy so large a portion of the Letters as to have become associated with his name to such a degree as to have entirely thrown into the shade their most important features, and to have

greatly misled people as to their author's character, fall into three categories.

First come a series of precepts so elementary as to be useless nowadays to any boys who have been decently brought up, but which are curious enough as showing how very low was the standard of manners in the middle of the eighteenth century at our public schools and universities.

Secondly, we find a great multitude of injunctions which were extremely valuable for one who was to spend a great part of his life in courts, as courts were during the "torrent's smoothness" which preceded the Niagara of the French Revolution. Many of them hold good at the present day, many do not; but it is unnecessary to dwell upon either. They were the tools of Philip Stanhope's trade, but are too technical to give any value to the book for general purposes now.

Thirdly, we have a number of maxims which are, and always will be, of great importance. I subjoin a very few of these :

"In the case of scandal, as in that of robbery, the receiver is always thought as bad as the thief." (Letter cxxxiv.)

"A man of the world must, like the chameleon, be able to take every different hue; which is by no means a criminal or abject, but a necessary complaisance, for it relates only to manners, and not to morals." (Letter cxxxiv.)

"Cautiously avoid talking of either your own or other people's domestic affairs. Yours are nothing to them, but tedious; theirs are nothing to you. The subject is a tender one; and it is odds but you touch somebody or other's sore place: for, in this case there is no trusting to specious appearances; which may be, and often are, so contrary to the real situations of things that, with the best intentions in the world, one often blunders disagreeably." (Letter cxxxv.)

"The scholar, without good breeding, is a pedant; the philosopher, a cynic; the soldier, a brute: and every man disagreeable." (Letter xvi.)

"There are two sorts of good company; one which is called the *beau monde*, and consists of those people who have the lead in courts, and in the gay part of life; the other consists of those who are distinguished by some peculiar merit, or who excel in some particular and valuable art or science. For my own part, I used to think myself in company as much above me, when I was with Mr. Addison and Mr. Pope, as if I had been with all the princes in Europe." (Letter xvi.)

"All general reflections, upon nations and societies, are the trite, threadbare jokes of those who set up for wit without having any, and so have recourse to common-places." (Letter lxxviii.)

"Company is a republic too jealous of its liberties to suffer a dictator even for a quarter of an hour."<sup>1</sup> (Letter cc.)

"Good breeding carries along with it a dignity that is respected by the most petulant. Ill-breeding invites and authorizes the familiarity of the most timid.

---

(1) It is curious to compare Chesterfield's idea of conversation with that of Dr. Johnson. To the latter conversation was a gladiatorial combat, in which he succeeded best who showed the greatest skill in fence combined with the strongest sinews. To the former it was either a means of adding to one's knowledge, or a harmless relaxation from business, in which he succeeded best who gave to his companions the greatest amount of pleasure.



No man ever said a pert thing to the Duke of Marlborough. No man ever said a civil one (though many a flattering one) to Sir Robert Walpole." (iv. 304.)

"When the old clipped money was called in for a new coinage in King William's time, to prevent the like for the future, they stamped on the edges of the crown pieces these words, *et Decus et Tutamen*. That is exactly the case of good breeding." (iv. 304.)

There is not a shadow of foundation for the idea that the manner which found favour with Chesterfield was an over-elaborate or affected one. That Dr. Johnson should have considered it so to be is natural enough, but as a matter of fact it was simply the kind of manner which is the usual outcome of good-feeling, a strong desire to please, and a wide acquaintance with men and things.

The objects of his supreme horror and aversion were the young Englishmen who were sent to travel abroad at twenty, "but who in truth stayed at home all the while, for, being very awkward, confoundedly ashamed, and not speaking the languages, they go into no foreign company—at least, none good." Of these he has given a number of sketches, as in Letters cl., clxi., &c. &c.

The kind of manner which Chesterfield approved, has been approved ever since, and will be approved to the end of time, by all competent judges. I do not know that it has ever been better described, than by a man who was the very antithesis of Chesterfield, in the warmth of his feelings, the loftiness of his ideal, and the depth of his enthusiasm. In a letter marked by all that curious felicity of style which received and deserved the enthusiastic praise of Montalembert, Albert de la Ferronnays writes :

"Quant à l'élégance, je me fie à toi et je suis sûr que tu as celle que tu sais, celle que j'aime, ce bon goût cosmopolite qui n'est d'aucun pays et qui est de tous : un cachet étranger, ni italien, ni français, ni espagnol, mais de tout un peu, de rien en entier ; une tournure à part, une mise à part, un parfum à part : tu me comprends, n'est-ce pas ?"

The reason why Chesterfield so constantly referred to the subject of manners was, that they were Philip Stanhope's weak point. All his father's efforts never succeeded in making him other than what he was born, a very uncouth and clumsy person. Even Mr. Harte, who was much attached to him, and who was himself as unfortunate, admitted that Stanhope wanted nothing except good manners, but that the want of them, considering his destination, was a fatal one.

The best as well as the most numerous of Chesterfield's maxims refer much more to the conduct of life than to manners, understood in their narrower sense.

Such are the following :

"I would wish you to be a Corinthian edifice, upon a Tuscan foundation ; the latter having the utmost strength and solidity to support, and the former all possible ornaments to decorate." (Letter clvi.)

"Whoever is in a hurry, shows that the thing he is about is too big for him. Haste and hurry are very different things." (Letter clviii.)

"Tout brillant qui ne résulte pas de la solidité et de la justesse de la pensée, n'est qu'un faux brillant. Le mot italien sur le diamant est bien vrai à cet égard, *quanto più sodezza, tanto più splendore*." (Letter ccv.—in French.)

"Pray be always in motion. Early in the morning go and see things; and the rest of the day go and see people." (Letter ccxvi.)

"The political reflections (in the Memoir of Cardinal de Retz), which are most of them printed in italics, are the justest that ever I met with; they are not the laboured reflections of a systematical closet politician, who, without the least experience of business, sits at home and writes maxims; but they are the reflections which a great and able man formed, from long experience and practice in great business. They are true conclusions drawn from facts, not from speculations." (Letter cxiii.)

"A proper secrecy is the only mystery of able men; mystery is the only secrecy of weak and cunning ones." (iv. 298.)

"A man who tells nothing, or who tells all, will equally have nothing told to him." (iv. 298.)

"When a man of sense happens to be in that disagreeable situation, in which he is obliged to ask himself more than once, *What shall I do?* he will answer himself, Nothing. When his reason points out to him no good way, or at least no way less bad than another, he will stop short and wait for light. A little busy mind runs on at all events, must be doing; and, like a blind horse, fears no dangers, because he sees none. *Il faut savoir s'ennuyer*." (iv. 299.)

"Patience is a most necessary qualification for business; many a man would rather you heard his story than granted his request. One must seem to hear the unreasonable demands of the petulant unmoved, and the tedious details of the dull untired. That is the least price that a man must pay for a high station." (iv. 299.)

"In business, an elegant simplicity, the result of care, not of labour, is required. Business must be well, not affectedly dressed; but by no means negligently. Let your first attention be to clearness, and read every paragraph after you have written it, in the critical view of discovering whether it is possible that any one man can mistake the true sense of it, and correct it accordingly." (Letter ccxxxiii.)

"Lay aside the best book whenever you can go into the best company; depend upon it you change for the better." (Letter ccxlviii.)

"Trivial futile books swarm and buzz about one every day; flap them away, they have no sting." (Letter ccxlviii.)

"Common sense (which in truth is very uncommon) is the best sense I know of: abide by it; it will counsel you best." (Letter cxxxii.)

"The height of abilities is, to have *volto sciolto* and *pensieri stretti*; that is, a frank, open, and ingenuous exterior, with a prudent and reserved interior." (Letter cxxxiv.)

"Young as you are, I hope you are in haste to live; by living, I mean living with lustre and honour to yourself, with utility to society; doing what may deserve to be written, or writing what may deserve to be read: I should wish both." (Letter clxxxvii.)

From Leipzig young Stanhope went with his tutor to the Courts of Dresden, Berlin, and Vienna, whence they passed into Italy. While in that country he was encouraged by his father to pay a fair amount of attention to art and antiquities; although, even there, history, languages, and society were to be his chief care. His Murray, by the way, was to be Alberti, a work "from whence I am assured," says Chesterfield, "that Mr. Addison, to save himself trouble, has taken most of his remarks and classical references."

After leaving Italy, tutor and pupil travelled by slow journeys to Paris, whence Mr. Harte returned to England, but his late charge remained, devoting himself, or being supposed to devote himself, not apparently with any great success, to his "exercises."

The exercises on which Chesterfield insisted were riding, fencing, and dancing. It is odd that in the case of a person who was to move so much about the world as Philip Stanhope, he should not have added swimming. For field-sports he had the most hearty contempt, and avowed it in a manner which seems strange when we think what a large place they now fill in the lives of men of his class in England. In Letter cxxiv. he says :

"All gaming, field-sports, and such sort of amusements, where neither the understanding nor the senses have the least share, I look upon as frivolous, and as the resources of little minds, who either do not think or do not love to think."

Again, in Letter cxlviii., we find these words :

"Sottish drinking, indiscriminate gluttony, driving coaches, rustic sports such as fox-chases, horse-races, &c., are, in my opinion, infinitely below the honest and industrious professions of a tailor and a shoemaker, which are said to *dérogéer*."

Again, in Letter ccxxx., he remarks :

"The poor beasts here are pursued and run down by much greater beasts than themselves ; the true British fox-hunter is most undoubtedly a species appropriated and peculiar to the country which no part of the globe produces."

Possibly the brilliant way in which hunting is now managed in this country might have induced him somewhat to modify his language ; but he would, it can hardly be doubted, have sympathized with him who said, "England is the only country on the face of the earth where you are thought to have given a sufficient account of a gentleman of fortune and position, and one creditable to the person spoken of, if you say, 'He is a Master of Hounds.'"

It is interesting to speculate as to what he would have thought of the interest excited, not in the crowd, but amongst people of his own rank, by the Boat Race, or the Public Schools Match at Lord's. The cricket of his day he classes with pitch-furthing, evidently considering both as very good games for little boys. Eight-oared boat-racing had not broken out in those times.

During Stanhope's residence in Paris, his father directed him to see all the best forms of society, to go much to Court and to the foreign ambassadors, to frequent as much as he was allowed to do the society of the more eminent men of letters, Montesquieu, Fontenelle, and the like. He was also to pay much attention to the courts of justice, and the general principles of the French law.

After a short visit to England, the young man returned to Paris, where he continued his education, and worked as a supernumerary attaché at the Embassy, under Lord Albemarle. After that he passed into Germany, and went eventually to Hanover, in the suite of the Duke of Newcastle.

"It is your first crisis," writes his father; "the character which you acquire there will, more or less, be that which will abide by you for the rest of your life. You will be tried and judged there, not as a boy, but as a man; and from that moment there is no appeal for character: it is fixed. To form that character advantageously you have three objects particularly to attend to; your character as a man of morality, truth, and honour; your knowledge in the objects of your destination, as a man of business; and your engaging and insinuating address, air, and manners, as a courtier; the sure and only steps to favour. Merit at Courts, without favour, will do little or nothing; favour, without merit, will do a great deal; but favour and merit together will do everything." (Letter ccl.)

Stanhope was now at the age when most boys are on the eve of leaving school. About a year afterwards his father wrote to him as follows:

"You are now but nineteen, an age at which most of your countrymen are illiberally getting drunk on port, at the University. You have greatly got the start of them in learning; and if you can get the start of them in the knowledge and manners of the world, you may be very sure of outrunning them in Court and Parliament, as you set out so much earlier than they. They generally begin but to see the world at one-and-twenty; you will by that age have seen all Europe. They set out upon their travels unlicked cubs; and in their travels they only lick one another, for they seldom go into any other company. They know nothing but the English world, and the worst part of that too, and generally very little of any but the English language; and they come home at three or four-and-twenty, refined and polished (as is said in one of Congreve's plays) like Dutch skippers from a whale-fishing. The care which has been taken of you, (to do you justice) the care you have taken of yourself, has left you, at the age of nineteen only, nothing to acquire but the knowledge of the world, manners, address, and those exterior accomplishments. But they are great and necessary acquisitions, to those who have sense enough to know their true value; and your getting them before you are one-and-twenty, and before you enter upon the active and shining scene of life, will give you such an advantage over all your contemporaries, that they cannot overtake you; they must be distanced." (Letter cclxiv.)

The reader who has accompanied me thus far will have seen that Chesterfield was not easily satisfied in the matter of solid acquisitions, and the following passage will impress that fact even more firmly on his mind.

In a letter written to Stanhope, when he was only seventeen, his father says:

"When I cast up your account as it now stands, I rejoice to see the balance so much in your favour; and that the items *per contra* are so few, and of such a nature, that they may be very easily cancelled. By way of debtor and creditor, it stands thus:

Creditor, by French.

German.

Italian.

Latin.

Greek.

Logic.

Ethics.

History.

Jus { Naturæ.

Gentium.

Publicum.

Debtor, to English.

Enunciation.

Manners.

This, my dear friend, is a very true account, and a very encouraging one for you. A man who owes so little, can clear it off in a very little time, and if he is a prudent man will; whereas a man who by long negligence owes a great deal, despairs of ever being able to pay; and therefore never looks into his accounts at all." (Letter xcvi.)

It is not quite clear what Chesterfield meant by Ethics and Logic, but it is hardly probable that Stanhope had devoted any great amount of attention to either study. The other items on the creditor side, however, imply a large amount of acquisition for a boy of seventeen. As a matter of fact, thanks to the abominable arrangements of our schools and colleges, a far humbler curriculum than that which Philip Stanhope had passed through at seventeen, is not finished till two or three-and-twenty, even by clever young men. And there is no reason to suppose that Philip Stanhope was clever. He was brought up on a plan which was relatively good, under excellent teachers; that was all the mystery.

Now, we should be well content, in the case of a man who desired to arrive at the highest political success, if general education could be finished by one or two-and-twenty. The literature that ought to be read early, even if attention is only given to the very best books in each language, has enormously increased since Chesterfield's day; so have the mass and complication of modern history, and time must be found for the attainment of sound general ideas with reference to the elements of natural science, political economy, and our own municipal law. All this might well cover the whole period before one or two-and-twenty, even if time were gained by beginning the classics late, abandoning Latin composition, and throwing overboard everything now taught which could not successfully re-state the reasons of its existence.

A man, however, who aimed at the highest political success for his son, would not be satisfied without giving him a special preparation for politics, after his general education was complete. The range over which the modern statesman's knowledge must extend is far greater than that which was sufficient in the middle of the last century. A modern English statesman who limited his views as completely to Europe as Chesterfield very properly did, would inevitably be a very bad statesman. Nearly the whole of our

existing colonial empire, and nearly the whole of our Indian Empire, have grown up since those days. In one of his later letters Chesterfield just mentions Clive, but, naturally, without having the faintest inkling of the way in which the deeds of the "bright-eyed young adventurer" would react upon and complicate our European position. An English statesman must in these days, if he would be anything but a blind guide, extend his view over the whole world. To him, more than to anybody else, apply the wise words of M. Laffitte, in his remarkable, and surely not sufficiently well-known book, *Les grands types de l'Humanité* :—

"Les chefs européens, il y a encore deux siècles, n'avaient guère à porter leur regards au delà de l'Occident. C'est tout au plus si la Turquie, de temps à autre, venait leur rappeler qu'il existait des orientaux. Toute la diplomatie se pratiquait entre populations qui s'étaient élevées ensemble, qui avaient contribué toutes, bien qu'à des degrés divers, à fonder une même civilisation, qui possédaient une croyance commune, dont les mœurs et les lois n'étaient point trop différentes. Mais aujourd'hui l'homme d'état doit porter dans sa tête la planète entière. L'Occident n'est qu'un point, l'Afrique et l'Asie l'inquiètent autant et plus qu'une partie quelconque de la vieille Europe; il faut conclure des traités avec les peuples de l'extrême Orient; il faut savoir ce qui se passe à Pékin, à Jeddo, à Calcutta, ou à Benarès. Comment cultiver ces relations, nouer ces alliances, gouverner en un mot, si l'on ignore ces populations, si l'on n'apprécie pas à leur valeur les civilisations qu'elles ont constituées? Le temps où l'on traitait de barbares ou d'imbéciles tout ce qui n'était pas chrétien est définitivement passé."

If, then, some knowledge of India and other Asiatic countries, together with some acquaintance with the British colonies, must be added to those subjects on which Chesterfield insisted, it is evident that we want more time. But the two great subjects we have mentioned are far indeed from exhausting the list of new requirements. The relations not only of the states of the Old World, but of those of the New, have become part of the knowledge which a man who destined his son for a political career, with the hopes which Chesterfield kept before his mind, would naturally desire him to possess.

If, however, more time is required for preparation, more is available. It has been seen that young Stanhope was already beginning the world at nineteen. He had, however, two advantages which even the sons of the greatest magnates cannot now command. His father could put him in the House of Commons as soon as he was of age, and could keep him in it while he fulfilled diplomatic functions abroad, only coming home to take part in its proceedings from time to time, at the call of the Government of the day, or as suited his own convenience. So that his political education for the highest posts was really being continued for a long time in the best possible way.

Few, however, are those who have the good fortune to get even into the House of Commons in these days at one or at five-and-twenty; while no one finds himself at either of those ages both a

legislator and a diplomatist. Now, too, that the custom of allowing ministers and ambassadors to attach persons, in whom they take an interest, to their legations or embassies has ceased to exist, and that private secretaryships are given chiefly to members of the permanent Civil Service, the chance of young men who are preparing for political life getting any training in business of the highest and widest kind is much diminished. The best substitute for it which circumstances permit is probably that which so many take to, namely, writing in newspapers and periodicals. But that, although it has many advantages, does not call into play the same faculties, and is subject to many drawbacks. Inconvenient, however, as it is that young men should have so few opportunities of being trained to statesmanship, it is in the nature of things, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose that, until the wealthy take the trouble really to train their sons for a political career, it will ever be otherwise. Constituencies naturally look out for a member who they think will represent them well when first elected, and cannot, except in rare cases, be expected to speculate on what he may become in a dozen years.

There is probably only one thing that could be done by the community, which would at all tend to give to the education of the highest class in this country a really statesmanlike turn, but happily that is a thing which it is for other reasons most important to do.

A very great and real improvement might be effected in the training of that class, if it were once for all determined that the diplomatic service was to be composed exclusively of persons of high intellectual attainments. The easiest and least invidious way to effect this would be to have, once a year, an examination open to every man under four or five-and-twenty in those subjects which Chesterfield, if he were now amongst us, would have prescribed. This examination should be conducted by a board composed of ex-ministers, ambassadors, and other functionaries of the highest rank, with, of course, a proper amount of technical assistance. It should be so arranged as to bring out, not only knowledge, but also readiness, and presence of mind; and should therefore be largely *vivâ voce*. The standard should be kept extremely high, and it should be surrounded by a far greater amount of dignity and public recognition than any other examination. The names of not more than twelve of the best candidates should be announced by the examiners in a class list, from which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should, at his own absolute discretion, select the persons to fill the attachéships in the regular line of the service, and the clerkships in the Foreign Office, which might fall vacant during the year; while all ministers and ambassadors should be empowered to take as supernumerary unpaid attachés, and with no claim to rise in the service,

any persons whose names were found in the list. If such an examination were set on foot, and properly organized, it may be hoped that success in it would become an object with a considerable percentage of those young men who do not require to go into a money-making profession, but who would hail the opportunity of having their names advertised to the nation as those of persons who had given themselves with success to the kind of studies which lie at the root of statesmanship. Such men would undoubtedly have a better chance in many constituencies than persons who could not bring forward any testimonials to their political knowledge and ability. The fact of a man having taken this or that degree at the Universities conveys very little to the mind of an electoral committee, even when the degree taken really represents knowledge of a kind important to them, which is only rarely the case, but the guarantee afforded by such an examination as I suggest would be altogether different.

After some further travelling in Germany, Stanhope returned to England, and took his seat in the House of Commons. His father had been long turning his attention in that direction, for the House of Commons was then, much more than it is even now, the natural road to be taken by any one who, not born a peer, wished to arrive at a great position in the State. That assembly is doubtless much changed and improved since the day when so keen an observer as Chesterfield could write as follows:

"To bring this directly to you; know that no man can make a figure in this country but by Parliament. Your fate depends upon your success there as a speaker; and, take my word for it, that success turns much more upon manner than matter. Mr. Pitt, and Mr. Murray, the Solicitor-General, uncle to Lord Stormont, are beyond comparison the best speakers; why? only because they are the best orators. They alone can influence or quiet the House; they alone are so attended to, in that numerous and noisy assembly, that you might hear a pin fall, while either of them is speaking. Is it that their matter is better, or their arguments stronger, than other people's? Does the House expect extraordinary informations from them? Not in the least; but the House expects pleasure from them, and therefore attends; finds it, and therefore approves." (Letter cccxi.)

"The receipt to make a speaker, and an applauded one, too, is short and easy. Take of common sense *quantum sufficit*, add a little application to the rules and orders of the House, throw obvious thoughts in a new light, and make up the whole with a large quantity of purity, correctness, and elegance of style." (Letter cclxxii.)

It may be that no orator of our day has equalled the elder Pitt in his highest flights, but good speaking of the kind just below the highest has increased so much, that a man who was satisfied with the amount and kind of excellence which Chesterfield prescribed would not stand out from his fellows enough to obtain any great name.

Again, the vast variety of business which the House of Commons



has accumulated in its own hands requires for its proper transaction a far greater amount of special knowledge than was requisite to meet the comparatively simple exigencies of Chesterfield's day, and the men who have that special knowledge are respectfully listened to, even when they speak detestably.

Still, after all allowance has been made for the change of circumstances, there remains a great deal of truth in Chesterfield's remarks. A musical well-managed voice, and a graceful manner of speaking, go very much further with the House of Commons than is at all generally supposed by those who are not intimately acquainted with it. Of course, it would be easy to mention men on both sides of politics who have had very great success in spite of the possession of almost every defect against which Chesterfield warned his correspondent; but I suppose there are few men who have been long familiar with it, who would not say that adequate abilities accompanied by the sort of charm which a man like the late Lord Herbert had in so supreme a degree, would advance a man in the House of Commons more quickly than the most commanding genius, unaccompanied by that charm.

The letters which can properly be called educational end with that of 27th November, 1754, number cclxxix., in the fourth volume, and those which extend from 1756 to Philip Stanhope's death, in 1768, are at once of less interest, and far fewer in number.

Chesterfield's labours turned out only very partially successful, but they failed precisely where he expected them to fail. In 1748, he had written to his son: "I will tell you, sincerely, my hopes and fears concerning you. I think you will be a good scholar, and that you will acquire a considerable stock of knowledge of various kinds: but I fear that you neglect what are called little, though in truth they are very material things; I mean gentleness of manners, an engaging address, and an insinuating behaviour; they are real and solid advantages, and none but those who do not know the world, treat them as trifles. I am told that you speak very quick and not distinctly; this is a most ungraceful and disagreeable trick, which you know I have told you of a thousand times; pray attend carefully to the correction of it. An agreeable and distinct manner of speaking adds greatly to the matter; and I have known many a very good speech unregarded, upon account of the disagreeable manner in which it has been delivered, and many an indifferent one applauded, for the contrary reason." (Letter cxxv.)

This was exactly what happened. Philip Stanhope turned out an extremely well-informed, nay, learned man; but he showed no aptitude whatever for oratory, all but breaking down in his maiden speech, while he was quite remarkable for the want of those manners of which his father had said to him, very early in the day, that

"though the last, and it may be the least ingredient of merit," they were, however, "very far from being useless in its composition."

It would have been vain to argue in favour of Chesterfield's method from the accident of its having succeeded in the case of Philip Stanhope, and it is equally vain to argue against it from the accident of its having partially failed with him. It must be judged on its own merits, but it would be very interesting to learn from some critic who, like Chesterfield, had directed great affairs, what, if any, are its weak points, other than those which, however important, are not of its essence, and to which I have pointedly called attention at the outset of these remarks.

If Chesterfield's method, with the large modifications which have been suggested, is not the best education for a statesman before he is old enough to take a part in politics, then which is the best?

That is a question which *les classes dirigeantes* in all countries had better ask and answer wisely, if they are not ere long to be contemptuously thrust aside by the new social strata as *les classes digérantes*. Let them show that they are fit to lead, and they will continue to do so for many a long day, at least in England. They have wealth and hereditary predisposition in their favour; why should they not add to these advantages a reasonable amount of taking trouble?

When every other avocation is beginning to discard mere rule of thumb, perhaps a little more systematic training for the most dignified of all avocations would not be wholly amiss. From time to time some political genius appears who seems so great that no training would have made him greater. That, however, is probably an optical illusion, produced by the atmosphere of admiration through which we gaze on him. Even in medicine we hear of wonderful things being done by irregular practitioners. An orthodox physician said disparagingly of one of these who was attending a friend of mine the other day, "Ce n'est pas un médecin, c'est un guérisseur!" We may smile at that, but none the less do we usually prefer that our medical attendants should have been educated for their profession.

M. E. GRANT-DUFF.

## THE INDIAN FINANCES.

It appears to be one of the conditions under which the administration of India is conducted that public attention should be directed to it only in a fitful, irregular way. In ordinary times, when things are going smoothly, Indian politics have little interest for the English public, and but little note is taken of the state of Indian finance. But now and again there occurs what is called a financial crisis, when writers and politicians wake up to a sense of the importance of the subject, and the previous indifference is followed by an almost exaggerated reaction. This happened in 1859, when India was struggling under the embarrassment caused by the expenditure of the mutiny, and again ten years later, when a considerable deficit was announced, and it was thereon predicted that the bankruptcy of India was impending. And now another scare of the same sort has occurred, and those who do not profess more than a superficial knowledge of the subject appear to have carried away an impression from recent discussions that the finances of India are in a very bad way. But the feeling is by no means confined to these; even among the better informed there seems to be just now a feeling of despondency and alarm. It will be useful to inquire how far this feeling is justified by the facts. Are the finances of India really in the desperate condition represented? Or is their present state one of merely temporary embarrassment, calling indeed for suitable treatment, but which, it is reasonable to expect, will be successfully encountered in the present, as similar difficulties have been overcome in the past?

Foremost among the factors which have brought about the present state of public opinion on the subject must be placed the recent contributions to the discussion furnished by Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Hyndman, although an apology is due to the former for coupling their names together. However much one may have reason to dissent from the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Fawcett in this matter, still every one must recognise the scrupulous accuracy of his statement of the case and the fairness and sobriety of his arguments, while admiring the disinterested zeal which has set him to master a difficult and possibly thankless task. Mr. Hyndman, on the other hand, appears, with the most excellent intentions, to be incapable of understanding what constitutes valid evidence or what valid proof. And having set out with the belief that he had hit upon a great discovery—namely, that India was verging on ruin—all his later efforts seem to be directed towards endeavouring, not to find out the truth about things, but to establish a foregone conclusion. The result may

be observed in a certain casuistry to which a less polite name might be given, but the use of which seems to be not incompatible with perfect honesty of purpose. For example, in his first article he stated the cost of the Indian army and marine to be nearly nineteen millions sterling, whereon the editor of this review pointed out that he had overstated the figures by two millions. To this criticism Mr. Hyndman rejoins in his last article as follows: "Mr. John Morley says the cost of the army, marine, &c., is £17,000,000, and not nearly £19,000,000. He has omitted to add to his calculation the full proportionate loss on exchange for home charges, and a portion of the cost of the strategical railways. These bring the amount up to that which I have stated." But everybody who reads Mr. Hyndman's first article will see that he intended the reader to understand that the actual cost of the Indian army, as stated in the public accounts, was nearly nineteen millions, without any qualification for indirect charges. And it would be interesting to know by what process Mr. Hyndman has arrived at the cost of the "strategical railways." Every Indian railway is in one sense strategical, for every railway has been laid out to traverse the more populous districts, which the army is needed to hold in check, and every principal line is connected with the seaboard, whence the troops arrive. But to determine to what extent any given railway is strategical and to what extent commercial is quite impossible. And if once you begin laying on indirect charges, why stop at railways? Why not debit the army with a part of the cost, indeed the whole cost, of the civil administration? We could not hold India without the army, and we could not maintain the army without raising a revenue. So that, properly speaking, the army costs, not nineteen millions, as Mr. Hyndman modestly puts it, but forty millions. The truth is, that when once we begin to talk about indirect charges and proportionate shares of this or that expenditure, we are landed in a tissue of absurdities and inconsistencies, and the army, or any other part of the public service, may be made to cost anything or nothing, according to the way of putting the case. It would be just as fair to say that the army costs nothing, because the civil administration could not exist without it, and to debit the different civil departments with a proportionate share of the cost of the army, which renders their existence possible, as to employ the reverse process. But, although absurd, it is none the less unfair to adopt this sort of argument. When dealing with public accounts, unless the figures quoted are those stated in the accounts, without reservations, all argument on them becomes impossible; either disputant may wriggle out of any statement he puts forward.

So much for his facts. From his way of drawing inferences, Mr. Hyndman evidently belongs to the class of persons who think that whatever happens to themselves or in their own time is the most

wonderful thing in its way that has happened at any time. When the Crimean war broke out, Dr. Cumming and several other excellent persons would have it that the end of the world had come. Here was the real battle of Armageddon at last, with the pouring out of the seventh vial and all the rest of it. Never, they cried, was such a war seen before—such terrible desolation, such a running to and fro of the nations of the earth. They could not see that never had there been a great war which produced so little disturbance, being, as it were, a duel fought out by professional combatants in a corner of Europe, and inflicting a minimum of suffering on the civil populations of the countries engaged. The people who declaim about the decay of India suffer from the same incapacity to make allowance for the foreshortening of historical perspective. Mr. Hyndman has suddenly made the discovery that the people of India are very poor relatively to the people of England, whereupon he straightway assumes that what is new to him is new in itself—that the present condition of India is a phenomenon suddenly manifested of which he has made the discovery. So, too, Mr. Hyndman is a firm believer in the deterioration of the soil. The soil has gone on bearing crops for several thousand years, but, oddly enough, shows signs of failing just about the time when Mr. Hyndman began to write for the reviews. As to the alleged change in the climate of India caused by the denudation of forests, that here and there damage may have been done in this way is probable; but the most populous and fertile regions of India are, and have been from time immemorial, altogether beyond the influence of the forest tracts, which are for the most part uninhabited and uninhabitable; and to say that the denudation of the forests, even if it took place on a large scale, is affecting the climate of India generally, would be much as if one were to suppose that the harvest in Kent would be injured because some Highland laird was cutting down his fir-trees. While as for the general proposition which Mr. Hyndman seeks to establish, it must be observed that wealth and poverty are comparative terms; the point to consider is not whether India is poor relatively to England, but what is its present state compared with its past. To those who have seen the enormous strides made by India in material prosperity during the last few years, of which the enormous traffic that has sprung up over the country is only one of many signs; the general rise of wages; how prosperous trades, unknown before in India, have sprung into existence, the creation of English capital requiring skilled labour for its employment—the notion of questioning the fact savours of the grotesque.

But the increasing poverty of the people and the deterioration of the soil are trifling ills, according to Mr. Hyndman, compared with that caused by the employment of too many Europeans in India.

This happened in Mysore, for example. So long as Mysore was administered by Sir Mark Cubbon with only a small staff of European assistants, all went merrily; the crops were flourishing, the rain plentiful, and the people happy and prosperous. But when the staff of European officials was increased, and the surplus revenue, instead of being locked up in the treasury, was spent on public works, then came the famine. As Mr. Hyndman puts it:—"When European agency and public works are alike overdone, when foreign salaries and foreign systems are imposed upon the population to an extent which savours of the very fanaticism of so-called improvement, then, as we see, the result is starvation, ruin, and death—a famine-stricken population and an exhausted soil."

After this it only remains to put down the late frosts to a Tory administration. There are many persons who think that public works in India may be overdone, that the European agency is too large and costly, and that the army expenditure is susceptible of retrenchment; but their opinions will not be more readily accepted if aired in this strange fashion. To sober-minded persons who hold these views, it must be a loss rather than a gain to find Mr. Hyndman adopting them, but on entirely different grounds; if anything would be calculated to make one desist from attempting the reformer's part, it would be the desire to escape from the queer fellowship involved in this perfervid advocacy. It might seem almost like trifling with the reader to pursue the matter seriously, but for the attention which Mr. Hyndman's statements have attracted.

But a country may be prosperous while its government is embarrassed. Whether this is the case with India has now to be considered. And first, the preliminary data assumed by Mr. Fawcett on this head may be accepted. In preparing the Indian accounts, the English mode has been adopted of exhibiting gross receipts and gross charges; but although the principle is a sound one, the effect has undoubtedly been to swell largely both sides of the account. The Indian Government is a large manufacturing agency, and also a great railway proprietor. Thus, over and above the deductions which must be made from the receipts in the post-office and telegraph and other administrative departments, a large set-off must be made from the receipts from salt and opium for the cost of manufacture in order to arrive at the net revenue, while the receipts and expenditure under railways figure on the two sides of the accounts to the amount of several millions. A very large deduction must therefore be made from the apparent, in order to arrive at the virtual, revenue of India; while the former attains the large amount of nearly sixty-five millions, thus placing India high on the list among the countries of the world, the net revenues are in fact only about thirty-seven and a half millions sterling, from which has to be pro-

vided the cost of the army and civil administration and the interest on debt. Reasoning from these facts, and assuming the debt to be rapidly increasing, Mr. Fawcett has drawn in forcible outlines an alarming picture of the financial prospects of the Government of India, and as a necessary inference proposes sweeping economies in all directions; and it must be added that the desponding views exhibited in other quarters appear to give countenance to the conclusion. The question which it is now proposed to ask, and to endeavour to answer, is whether this sudden alarm and despondency are justified by the facts. I will merely premise, by the way, that it may be quite possible to hold with Mr. Fawcett a very strong opinion on the necessity of economy and reform in various directions, although on different grounds from those on which he seeks to establish the proposition.

The condition of the Indian finances has to be regarded from two points of view: first with reference to the current revenue and expenditure, and next with reference to the accumulation of debt. An apparent equilibrium from year to year will of course only serve to delude, if it be obtained by staving off the day when the obligations incurred must at last be faced. First, then, as regards revenue and expenditure, the ten years from 1868 to 1877 gave a net surplus of about three-quarters of a million, notwithstanding that during this period nearly nine millions sterling had been spent in famine relief, and that thirty-seven millions had been disbursed on public works out of the current revenues, exclusive of the expenditure on public works provided for by loans. So far it would appear that the position of the Indian finances was not at all unsatisfactory. The great expenditure involved by the Behar famine of 1874 and the succeeding year had been provided for out of current ways and means, simultaneously with this large outlay on public works from the same source. We may hold what opinions we please about the propriety of this latter expenditure, still the thing had been done. It is not until the year succeeding this decade, the year 1877-8, that cause for anxiety first made itself apparent. In this year there was a deficit of three and a half millions, caused by the outlay incurred to meet the great famine, which extended over the larger part of India. This outlay amounted to nearly five and a half millions, converting into a deficit what would otherwise have been a considerable surplus, notwithstanding that the charge for loss by exchange amounted to more than a million and a half. In the year which has just closed, 1878-9, fresh taxation was imposed to the extent of one and a half millions, giving an estimated surplus of two millions. The actual surplus is now put down at £1,450,000, the difference being more than explained by the increase of three-quarters of a million in the army estimates, due to the war in Afghanistan. It should also be

noted that in this year another half-million was disbursed on famine relief, and that the loss by exchange amounted to the formidable sum of three millions. Notwithstanding this, and the war, the year closes with a considerable surplus. This result would hardly appear to afford just grounds for alarm or despondency. What seems to have produced these feelings is the issue of the estimates for the present year, and the melancholy preface with which they have been set forth. The so-called famine fund, to be created by the extra taxation just referred to, has been swallowed up in the expenses of the year, and in lieu of the surplus of one and a half millions which that fund was to furnish, a deficit is anticipated of nearly the same amount. Under these circumstances the order has gone forth for economy and retrenchment in all branches of the administration; and the expenditure on public works especially, the amount of which is very much under the control of the Government, is to be largely cut down.

This change in the financial condition from a surplus to a deficit is readily explained. It arises partly from a fall in opium, partly from an addition of half a million to the loss by exchange, and partly from the increased army charges to provide for the war in Afghanistan. The expenditure on this head is two millions more than the expenditure for 1877-8. Now at first sight is this a state of things to cause despondency and alarm? India has paid no less than fourteen and a half millions for famine relief during the last six years, almost entirely out of revenue,<sup>1</sup> and if this new and weighty charge for loss by exchange had not accrued at the same time, simultaneously with the war with Afghanistan, it could have paid the cost of that also in the same way, and yet have been left with a handsome surplus. As it is, the war will involve a small addition to the public debt, but a smaller one than has been occasioned by any

(1) Sir Thomas Seecombe, in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons last March, speaks of the famine expenditure as having been paid for by loans. Now the amount of loans during the six years in question was twenty-seven and a quarter millions, and the expenditure on public works during the same time was about twenty-five and a quarter millions; and it certainly seems reasonable to consider that the money was borrowed for them rather than for the famine, which was necessarily a first charge on the revenue, whereas the public works expenditure was optional. Of course when a Government exceeds its revenue from any cause, the particular item which causes the excess is usually indeterminate. If it spends five millions on its army and five millions on education, and has to borrow five millions to make good a deficit, we may put down the deficit as being due to the army, or to education, according to fancy. It is like saying that if a man makes a journey, he walks so many miles with his right leg and so many with his left. In the present case, however, there is this reason for the selection, that the public works expenditure is professedly remunerative, and that a capital account of it can be and is kept; and at any rate this choice has been adopted in the accounts prepared at the India Office, in which it is the famine expenditure that is shown as a charge of the year, while the loans are shown as applied to the construction of railways and canals.



previous war. And, after all, is it a case for despondency that a country should not be able to pay for its wars without borrowing? Why, even in England it is thought not unreasonable to distribute a charge of this sort—a charge of comparatively trifling amount incurred for the purpose of averting war—over a series of years. Surely there is nothing financially discreditable to the Indian Government in resorting to what is practically the same plan?

To this, of course, it will be at once replied that the two cases are different. England could have paid for her war expenditure if she liked, but in India there is no such option; the limit of taxation has been reached, while the revenue is stationary. Every addition to the public debt involves so much more interest to pay, which there are no fresh means to meet, and a nearer approach to the inevitable day of reckoning. Further, that all that has been said about the large outlay disbursed on famines, and on the loss by exchange, is merely to state the peculiar liabilities to which India is subject. She may have met her engagements in the past; but each claim of this sort leaves her less able to cope with the responsibilities of the future. The very facts, it may be urged, that India has been called on to spend fourteen or fifteen millions on famine relief in six years, and that her revenues are received in a depreciated currency, involving this heavy loss by exchange, are just what make the situation so gloomy and alarming.

As regards the liability to famine, however, it has to be remembered that such periods of calamity as India has just gone through have been the exception in the past, and at any rate a certain amount of administrative fortitude will not be unbecoming in awaiting what time may have in store for us. But if we cannot penetrate into the secrets of the future, it is at least possible to grapple with the plain evils of the present. Remove the other great burden, the loss by exchange, and the relief obtained in this way will alone suffice to restore the Indian budget to a sound condition.

This loss by exchange, it need hardly be explained, arises from the Indian Government having to make payments in gold in this country to the amount of seventeen millions a year, while receiving its revenues in silver, which has undergone a great depreciation with respect to gold. And the remedy for this is to be found in the establishment of a gold standard for India, although to do so would not necessarily involve the introduction of a gold currency. In the discussion which so far has taken place on this proposal, the argument, it may be confidently asserted, has been all one side. Indeed, the only reason having even the appearance of weight which has been advanced against the plan is, that it is not silver which has fallen in value, but gold which has risen; that, therefore, the

adoption of a gold standard, by "appreciating" the rupee, and thus enhancing the claims of all creditors, including the Indian Government which is the largest creditor of any, would involve a breach of contract with all who have to make silver payments, and in the case of the Indian taxpayer a virtual increase of taxation. To this it seems sufficient to reply that there is no evidence that the rupee has yet undergone any depreciation, and that it is reasonable to suppose it has not, the mass of the Indian currency being too large to have become affected as yet by a fall in the price of the comparatively small amount of silver offered for sale in the market, and around which the great fluctuations of the last three years have taken place; that the appreciation will therefore take place only with respect to gold, and not with respect to commodities; while on the other hand the proposed measure will prevent that depreciation of the rupee, which must sooner or later occur if the present relative values of gold and silver are maintained. Further, that the disturbance of contracts occasioned by a change of standard would be much less than that produced by retaining a silver standard, because the contracts based on the old relations of the two metals far exceed in amount and importance those which have been made since the fall in the gold-value of silver began to set in. Had the gold standard been adopted before that took place, the question of breach of contract would never have arisen; and therefore the fact that a restoration of the Indian standard would affect the contracts made during the past three years is not a sufficient reason for ignoring the disturbance of previous contracts between the public debtors and creditors of India, reaching back to the beginning of the century. Finally, if it be urged that the change of standard would involve a virtual increase of taxation, it may be replied that the increase, taking as it would an indirect form, hardly sensible to the taxpayer, would be far less objectionable than an increase made in any other way, an increase which will become necessary if the depreciation of silver goes on, but from attempting to impose which in any direct form Indian financiers may well shrink in dismay. The indirect increase referred to would be precisely of the same kind as that which is believed to be now taking place in England, as, for example, in the payment of income-tax, on the assumption that every sovereign is now worth more than it was two years ago.

It is important to observe that a precedent for the proposed measure is to be found in the action of the Dutch Government, which has lately introduced a gold standard into its East-Indian possessions, without, however, superseding the silver currency in use there, preventing thereby both a loss of its revenue as well as the fluctuations in the exchange which are found at the present time so detrimental and embarrassing to the trade between England and India. The real

obstacle in the way is probably, however, not the force of arguments which can be disposed of as soon as stated, but the danger lest the Indian currency should be made a party question. The doctrine has unfortunately been laid down by a leading member of the Opposition, and a great authority on such matters, that the countries using gold and silver respectively should each rest satisfied with their own currencies. Sometimes one may get the best of the bargain and sometimes the other; but we are to hope that a guiding Providence will so provide the supplies of the precious metals now hidden underground, but hereafter to be dug out, that in the long run they shall be adjusted to the relative needs of the two classes of nations. If not, so much the worse for one or the other—so much the worse for India as things go now. But on no account is a country to change its standard from one metal to the other; while as for a universal bi-metallism, which would remove the difficulty for ever for all nations, against a proposal to establish this there would be enlisted all the prejudice and ignorance of which there is such an ample store at command among the moneyed interests of London. It must be admitted, therefore, that the chances do not appear in favour of a remedy being promptly applied;<sup>1</sup> but this is certain, that the depreciation of silver may reach a point at which even English party considerations will have to give way. India can just get along when this loss amounts to four millions a year. But if it should reach six or eight millions a year—and there is no reason why it should not—then unquestionably something will have to be done. The advocates for the *laissez-aller* policy may say, perhaps, that it is just as likely that the turn of events will be the other way, and that silver may recover itself. We must hope so; but that is hardly a very statesmanlike policy which would leave the financial stability of India at the mercy of these chances. In truth, the transactions of its Government in that country and England are so intimately connected that it is essential to their safe conduct that they should be based both on the same standard of value. It may be confidently predicted that sooner or later this truth will be generally recognised and acted on. In the meantime, the longer the delay, the greater will be the injury done and the difficulty of repairing it.

We have so far been dealing with the current revenues and expenditure of India; there is next to be considered the effect of the loan operations for public works. And here it is not necessary to reply seriously to those inaccurate alarmists who add the sums thus borrowed to the current expenditure, and bring out the deficit at so many millions a year. Deal with the accounts of any railway company while its works are under construction

(1) Since this article was written, the Government have announced that they do not intend to propose any remedial measure for the present.

in the same way, and it could be shown to be hopelessly insolvent. It is spending so many millions a year and receiving nothing in return. The policy of constructing public works is a thing to be discussed on its own merits; but in their present relation to the finances of India, surely the point to consider is not what is the capital expenditure of the particular year in question, but what are the returns, or prospects of returns, coming in as revenue to meet the interest payable on the capital sunk. Dealing with the case from this point of view, it may be and has been urged that this revenue from Indian public works cannot be expected to cover the interest on the capital outlay, and that if the Indian Government goes on borrowing, the day will come at last when it must break down under the load of obligations incurred. Here is fair matter for argument, on which a few remarks will now be offered.

It should first be explained that the Indian public works expenditure is divided into two categories, that on what are called 'ordinary' public works, which is provided for out of the revenues of the year, and that on 'reproductive' public works, constructed out of borrowed money. The first class, again, includes all the building operations of the Government for barracks, jails, and so forth, which are only public works in the sense of not being private ones, and also all works which, although distinctly beneficial to the country, do not afford any direct return, such as roads, which are everywhere free of tolls, and bridges; the embankments which confine the great rivers of the Gangetic Delta and elsewhere; and also a very considerable number of irrigation works, which, although they produce some revenue, are not expected to give a full return on their cost. Now as regards the financial effect of these operations we have no need for conjecture. They have been constructed, as I have said, out of the revenues of the year, and for the deficits which have occurred they are equally responsible with all other items of expenditure. As may be gathered from the figures already given, the net deficit during the twelve years ending March, 1879, has been about a million and a half,<sup>1</sup> and during this period the expenditure on 'ordinary' public works has amounted to nearly forty-five millions. A very small comparative reduction on this great sum would therefore have sufficed to convert this deficit into a surplus. That such a reduction was not made must be attributed to the conviction impressed on the Government of India of the importance of obtaining the results which this great expenditure—that is, the balance of it after the needful requirements for barracks and so forth have been provided for—is mainly destined to bring about.

Returning then to the other great division of public works expenditure, that from borrowed money, let us see whether there is really

(1) If we deduct one year—1877-8—during which nearly five and a half millions was spent on famine relief, the net surplus for the remaining eleven years was two millions.

cause for the alarm manifested about it in some quarters. Here, as I have said, we have to consider, not what is spent in the year, but the interest payable on it, and whether this interest, which from the nature of the case is constantly accumulating, is likely to exceed in the long run the returns from the works constructed with this borrowed capital. The works in question are of two kinds, railways and canals, which may be best dealt with separately.

With regard to railways, the first thing to notice is that the mischief, if such is to be the issue, has been done. One hundred and twenty millions have been borrowed and sunk already, a much larger sum than is likely to be spent in the future within any period that may reasonably be brought into the financial horoscope. And the case affords a curious illustration of the readiness of people to be misled by appearances. So long as the Indian Government was borrowing this great sum, not a word was said about the matter, simply because it employed the fiction of the guaranteed companies as its agency for raising the money. But as soon as the Government, instead of borrowing through a company at five per cent., goes into the market direct and borrows the money at four per cent., this outcry is raised of the danger of incurring such liabilities, and plunging into obligations which it will be unable to redeem. Now it can be readily understood that when the policy of constructing railways in India was first entered upon, thirty years ago, the prophets of evil might have had a strong case on which to base their gloomy predictions. The sum to be laid out was an enormous one relatively to the revenues of the time, while the result was necessarily shrouded in uncertainty. The construction of railways at all in a tropical climate was an experiment; works of enormous magnitude had to be carried out in a country affording no experience for such undertakings; the forces of nature, exerted on a scale unknown to moderate climates, had to be encountered; while it could not be told how far the people of India, with their prejudices and conservative disposition, would adapt themselves to this new way of travelling. Then, indeed, it might have appeared safe to predict financial disaster from so bold a venture; it would have been impossible to prove that this great expenditure—more than twice the then existing public debt of India—that this step in the dark would not lead to financial ruin. But now, when the great experiment has been brought to a successful conclusion, and the foundation laid of a sound and prosperous railway system, this cry is raised that railway construction is imperilling the Indian finances, simply because the disguise is thrown off in the mode of financing the operation, and it is seen to be the State, and not any private association, which is raising the capital. But how far do the results justify this alarm? In the year 1877-8, the last for which the complete accounts have been reported, the net charge for the interest

on guaranteed railway capital was less than five and a half millions, while the net revenue derived from them exceeded six millions. But this way of putting the case is very unfavourable, because the account includes a number of lines some of which have barely got into running order, while others are not yet complete. Nothing reasonable could be inferred about the Scinde and Punjab line, for example, from its present traffic returns, so long as its two portions remained unconnected, with an intervening gap of several hundred miles only just finished; on several other lines the traffic is quite undeveloped, and interest is being paid on capital much of which has not yet had time to become productive. A juster view of the case will be got by considering those lines on which the traffic is fairly established. Now in 1877 the East Indian Railway, the most important of all, fifteen hundred miles long, paid nine per cent. on its capital of thirty millions; the great Indian Peninsula paid six and a half per cent. on twenty-three millions of capital; the Eastern Bengal paid eight per cent.; the Bombay and Baroda nearly five and a half. The only line which can be properly pronounced completed, and which did not earn its guaranteed dividend, was the Madras Railway, paying only three and a half per cent.; but it may be truly said that without this railway the cost of making it might have been spent, yet not have sufficed to keep the people of Southern India alive during the late famine.

Next, as regards the lines, mostly of a lighter and cheaper kind, which have been constructed directly by the Government. The expenditure on these to the end of 1877 has been about seventeen and a half millions, the interest on which may be taken at £800,000. The working expenses for that year were about £400,000, and the net traffic receipts only £540,000. Here, then, appears a direct loss of three-quarters of a million on the operations of the year. But this inference would be arrived at by a mere jumble of figures. The State railways are a thing of yesterday; most of them are still under construction, and not one can be said to have yet established its traffic arrangements. Many of them, too, are still isolated lines, parts of a system still incomplete. The only fair way of looking at the matter would be to take those railways which are completed and see how they stand, without loading the calculation with the expenditure on the lines still in course of execution. Not one of the State railways can properly be said to come under this condition,—the Rajputana line, four hundred miles long, still needing an extension now in progress to be complete, while it is not yet properly equipped with stock. Yet this line, which had been finished only two years before the date of the last return, was already paying more than four per cent. Judged by the history of the early days of the East Indian line, this is not a bad beginning. Nor is it as if the proposal were to enlarge the scale of operations. The extension of the railway system is indeed contem-

plated, but at a much slower rate than heretofore. Not many years ago, the capital expenditure was going on at the rate of between six and seven millions annually; the sum proposed for the present year, even before the late scare, was a little over two millions. And if we want to consider rightly the present aspect of the Indian railway question, let us look at the map of India, and, observing the extent of what has been done, the enormous tracts still unprovided with railways, and the isolated positions of existing lines, say whether it would be reasonable to stop all further development of the railway system.

One point should here be mentioned. It will, perhaps, be alleged that whatever be the prospects of existing lines, they give too favourable a standard by which to estimate the results of the future, for that the best ground has now been occupied. This is true on the whole; but it must be remembered, on the other hand, that practice has brought experience, and that railways can now be made much more cheaply than was found practicable at first; further, that all extensions of existing lines will probably bring as great an indirect return by the development of traffic on the latter as a direct return on their own working. On the whole, there is no reason to expect a worse return for the money laid out in the future than on that expended in the past; while to any one who has seen the effect of railways in India already, the enormous traffic which has sprung up where none existed before; the markets they create for produce which, if grown at all, used to be valueless; the stability and certainty they give to all the operations of trade, and the powerful aid they afford against the ravages of famine—the notion of suspending railway progress at the point which it happens to have accidentally attained at the present moment seems perfectly monstrous. Yet this is what the alarmists propose. That any progress should be permitted at all, though at a greatly reduced rate, is a mere concession on their part. They would like all railway making in India to cease.

The guaranteed system had its faults, but at any rate it involved steady progress, and that when once a definite policy had been determined upon it should be persisted in. During the crisis of 1859, when the Indian finances were embarrassed by the cost of a tremendous war, to pay for which no arrangements had been made further than the clumsy device of a discredited open loan, and when it might with reason have been feared that the Indian Government was verging upon bankruptcy, nevertheless the progress of railway construction was steadily continued, because the money was nominally furnished from private funds; and now when we see how the policy of the Government towards its railways is made to depend on the varying phases of public opinion, action one year followed by reaction the next, reflecting the passing feeling of the day; and when we consider the positive waste occasioned by these fluctuations in the

scale of operation, and the discredit they attach to a direct execution of public works by a Government which is subject to such vacillation of purpose, it is impossible not to regret that the guarantee system has been abandoned. Without it the existing Indian railways would assuredly have never been made.

The other great class of Indian public works, those of irrigation, presents a somewhat different aspect. These works may be roughly divided into three kinds, each financially on a separate footing. First, there are the great tanks in Southern India, with which may be included the systems of irrigation of the deltas on the east coast, works of a much more scientific character than the tanks, but so far similar that great results have been produced with a small expenditure. The return from these undertakings cannot be precisely stated, because no separate water-rate is levied from them, the increased assessment which the irrigated land affords being merged in the general land revenue. But whether the return be the higher rates of fifty or sixty per cent. which some would claim for them, or the more moderate proportions admitted by more sober advocates, there is no room for doubt that they have been directly a most profitable investment, quite irrespective of the indirect benefit conferred in the safeguard they afford against famine, and the general prosperity they have brought about in the adjacent districts. Next to these in the scale of profit may be placed the great canals of Northern India, which, deriving their supplies from the snow-fed mountains of the Himalaya, are furnished with a perennial stream of water, independent of local draught. Two of these great works, the canals from the Jumna, have been highly remunerative, the latest returns being thirteen and a half and fourteen per cent. respectively on their cost. The Ganges Canal, the largest of all, pays four per cent. in water rent, or six per cent. if we include the increased land rent due to the irrigation. It will perhaps be objected that these rates, as well as the railway dividends just quoted, are calculated on the capital expenditure only, leaving out of sight the accumulation of charge over revenue during the earlier years, when these undertakings were not paying their expenses; and it is argued by some that these arrears ought to be debited to the capital accounts with compound interest in order to arrive at the correct return. But the charges in question have already been paid for, year by year, as they occurred, with the other current expenses of the State, and they cannot fairly be counted twice over. We may indeed say, if we please, that supposing the money thus spent had been applied to the reduction of debt, the finances would have been to that extent improved, and we may work out a compound interest sum on these data. But under this argument lurks the fallacious assumption that if the money in question had not been spent in this way—in main-



taining these works until they became remunerative—it would have been applied to extinguish debt. A very small acquaintance with the actual practice of Governments, especially the Indian Government, will suffice to dispel this illusion. That Government, beset by the pressure of conflicting claims for money in all branches of the administration, is virtually compelled, as the phrase goes, to cut its coat according to the cloth. The wants of such a Government are illimitable, its means strictly limited; and in practice these conflicting claims have to be met in the best way they can by a distribution among them of the available funds; and if the money in question had not been spent in keeping up these canals at a loss in their infancy, it would have gone in some other way—say in education, or in building jails, or extending the law courts. The position of the Government in this matter is precisely analogous to that of the person who borrows money to invest in a joint-stock enterprise, and pays the interest of the loan out of his income until the work returns a dividend. When calculating the return for his money he does not add the accumulated interest to the loan, because he has paid it already—not by withdrawing it from some other investment, but by retrenching his personal outlay. A case for considering this compound interest would lie only if the Government had been borrowing money during the years in which these charges occurred. Even in that case it could not be affirmed that it had borrowed for this particular purpose more than for its needs in any other branch of the administration. In truth this compound interest hypothesis is no more tenable as regards these public works than in considering any other class of expenditure, when it is at once seen to be absurd. The army, for example, costs four or five millions more than the critics think the proper amount; the actual cost should therefore be debited with compound interest on this excess, which, if it had not been wasted in this way, might have gone to pay off debt. Work out the account in this way, and the cost of the army at the present day may be made to amount to any sum we please. So a man may prove that the horse for which he gave a hundred pounds has really cost him five hundred. All that can be said of these accounts of public works, worked out on the method of compound interest, is that they represent an ideal result arrived at from assumptions contradicted by all experience of the facts. Admit this, and the works in question have proved a reasonable success, quite independent of the enormous indirect benefit they have conferred.

The third and last class of irrigation works consists of those constructed to store up rain water in various parts of the country, or to utilise the smaller rivers fed also by the periodical rain. It must be admitted of these that they are not such promising fields for operation as those we have been considering. The best

sites have been for the most part already taken up, and such works are liable to fail just when they are most needed. A direct return from these sufficient to cover the charge for interest is therefore doubtful, although many persons of high authority and sober judgment are of opinion that this will be eventually realised on them in the aggregate. But the question is not one that can be settled on this consideration alone. There is another way of spending money far less satisfactory than on unremunerative public works, and that is on famine relief. The position of the Indian Government, it cannot be too distinctly remembered, is unique and exceptional. Not only is it the landlord of the soil, and with the strongest interest, therefore, in preventing a failure of the crops on which its rent is dependent; it is also responsible to the English nation for keeping the people of India alive in times of famine. No expenditure of money or energy will suffice to do this without roads and railways, while just in proportion as these are available will the task become easier and cheaper. The extension of irrigation tends to stave off famine altogether, and even in the case of the least serviceable works just referred to, if they fail in the worst years, still they have contributed to enhance the stability of Indian agriculture in good seasons, and by admitting of the accumulation of capital among the people to render them better able to meet the vicissitudes of bad. It is these considerations, always present to those who are responsible, although appealing at different times with varying degrees of force, which lift the question out of one of simple arithmetic or finance. The fact that the Ganges Canal, for example, has irrigated just one million of acres during the past season, producing thereby an enormous quantity of food which could not otherwise have been grown, appeals to the senses in a way that cannot be gainsaid. It is this circumstance that the policy of public works for India cannot be determined on arithmetical arguments, but is complicated by moral and political considerations, which is the cause of all the controversy that has gathered round the question. The decision ultimately rests on opinion, and so standing, the weight of authority must count for much. And when we find successive Governors-General and their advisers, from the time of Lord Dalhousie downwards, giving their deliberate adhesion to the policy of pressing forward vigorously the extension of public works, notwithstanding the financial difficulties and dangers which such a policy involves, we may appreciate the force with which the importance of maintaining that policy has impressed itself on them. It may be added, that with the great majority of those who have endeavoured to approach the question dispassionately, the same opinion has been arrived at with all the force of conviction. By all such the checks which this

policy has from time to time undergone are viewed with regret, because they foresee that while a sudden change of this sort is necessarily wasteful, it will not be followed by any permanent retrenchment. When the next famine comes the popular cry will be all the other way; the champions of public works at any cost, with their extravagant nostrums for setting India to rights by unlimited irrigation and navigation, will then have their innings, and the pendulum will swing with equal violence in the opposite direction—a result equally to be regretted by those who desire to see the prosecution of Indian public works continued on a consistent, steady, and uniform plan.

The question will, of course, be asked, What rate of expenditure fulfils this condition, presenting the just mean between rashness and timidity? The notion now in favour would appear to be that, as regards works to be undertaken by borrowed capital, the amount of the loans should be limited by what it is found possible to raise year by year in India, so that the responsibility incurred will be for payment of the interest in silver only, which will, therefore, not be liable to enhancement by any further depreciation of that metal. But inasmuch as these silver loans, although tendered in India, are for the most part furnished from English capital, we may presume that the lenders, when tendering, have taken into account the loss that will accrue in converting their interest from rupees into sterling, so that the depreciation of silver has already been discounted in the rate at which the loan will be tendered for. All that appears to be secured by the assumed precaution, is prevention from the loss that might arise from any further depreciation of silver. On the other hand, in the event of a recovery of the value of silver, the advantage will have been surrendered; the loan will have been contracted for on permanently higher terms than might have been obtained in England. This mode of regulating operations does not, therefore, appear to offer any prominent advantages, while it involves the liability to constant changes in the rate of outlay, than which nothing is less conducive to real economy. Further, it cannot be too distinctly understood that, as a means of bringing about an equilibrium between the revenue and expenditure of the year, a sudden reduction in the amount of capital outlay has an effect quite disproportioned to the disturbance it produces by checking progress, because the resulting saving is only in the way of interest. Say that the sum to be borrowed for railways and canals is suddenly cut down, as is now proposed, from four and a half to two and a half millions, the immediate saving is about forty thousand pounds in the year, a sum which it may be confidently asserted will be wasted in the process, in keeping up a superfluous staff, or for compensation on reducing it. The true criterion would

rather appear to be that the amount of such loans should be regulated, not by the capacity of the Indian money market to furnish loans, but by the effect of the accumulation of interest on the revenues of the year. If the increase of this interest takes place faster than the increase of revenue, money is being borrowed too fast. Up to this time, when the debt for public works, including guaranteed railways, has reached a hundred and twenty-four millions, it cannot be said that this has taken place; even in the present undeveloped state of the works, revenue is overtaking interest. Nor would any reasonable person propose to continue the same rate of expenditure in the future as in the past. The ratio of increase of the debt, and therefore of the interest payable thereon, to the whole amount, will consequently be continually decreasing. But, further, it would seem to be a reasonable precaution to provide that, simultaneously with the construction of fresh works, the original cost of the earlier ones should be gradually paid off, so that eventually the capital debt for public works instead of increasing should be kept at a constant figure. This might be accomplished by charging to the public works capital account a higher rate of interest than is actually paid on its capital debt, and making over the difference to a trust to be invested in the purchase of that debt. There is, of course, no virtue in a sinking fund which this plan would create, so far that debt is not paid off sooner by its agency than it might be without it, and the plan is of course open to the criticism which may be employed on the paying off debt with one hand while creating fresh debt with the other. But it has this merit in the present case, that, besides introducing fixity into the operations concerned, it would increase the share of the burden placed on the present time to the relief of the future. The revenues of the year would be charged not merely with the interest of the capital outlay, but with a part of the capital itself, and in this way warning will be sooner given if the increase of that capital is tending to create a liability beyond the capacity of the revenue to bear.

The case of the public works has been treated at length, because a clear understanding on this point is essential to a correct appreciation of the real state of the Indian finances, and because it is the policy of public works which is in most danger of ill-considered action from any sudden changes of measure. I have endeavoured to show that while it is not the capital outlay on public works which is the cause of embarrassment, so also a sudden reduction of the scale of that expenditure will not give any sensible relief. Reverting now to the general question, the conclusion may be submitted that, on the whole, there is no just cause for the present attitude of despondency in regard to the finances of India. The increase to the public debt of late years has been inconsiderable, if we exclude the capital borrowed

for public works, and that gives reasonable promise of making a return sufficient to cover the obligation incurred for it. The finances are affected for the moment by a combination of accidents—embarrassing, because happening simultaneously—the war expenditure, the depreciation of silver, the loss of capital among the people of India from recent famine, and the general depression of trade, which affects India as well as every other country. If all these are to continue to operate for an indefinite time, then, indeed, we might be tempted to despair, and say that the burden of governing the country was too great to be sustained. But it is not the part of reasonable men to assume that everything will turn out for the worst—that nature will be exceptionally hostile throughout the last quarter of this century, that India will continue to be desolated by famine, that trade will always be bad, that the courage and ability necessary to deal with the currency will be wanting. And it seems as fair to believe that this is but one of the passing phases of financial difficulty which have so often occurred in the history of British India, and which have been always successfully encountered, as to assume that a general bankruptcy is for the first and last time impending.

But when all this is said, there still remains to admit the fact that the financial status of India is based on a foundation in one respect insecure. In countries such as England and France, although there will be usually a close coincidence between revenue and expenditure, this is merely because the strength of the country has not been put forth; there is a latent power of taxation which could be called into action if needed. In India this resource is wanting; by general agreement the limit of taxation has been nearly reached for the present. Further, the Indian revenue of late years has shown no signs of expansion. This is not the case, indeed, if we extend the cycle of observation. The growth of revenue during the past quarter of a century has been very great, and its present stationary condition is sufficiently accounted for by the recent famine and the universal depression of trade. But the effect of famines, although terrible, is only temporary. The development of Indian railways now places India for the first time in a position to take advantage of a revival of trade, and I firmly believe that country will ere long be seen to make an advance in material prosperity far transcending any movement of the kind which it has ever accomplished in the past. In 1859 things looked far blacker than they do now. Trade was paralysed by the great convulsion the country had just undergone, and the finances were staggering under the deadweight of a deficit of forty millions which that convulsion had produced. Two years later a great famine overspread the finest regions of the land. Yet from that time dates the sudden rise of

that wave of prosperity, indicated by increasing trade and expanding revenue, which has only lately spent itself. The conditions of the present day are still more favourable to such a sudden advance, which, when it begins, will assuredly be exhibited on a far larger scale.

Still in the meantime the deficit has to be got rid of, and since this cannot be done by extra taxation, even if such were justifiable, we must look to removing it by a reduction of expenditure. •Hence it may be quite possible to assent to the proposition that the most vigorous economy should be exercised, not because it will involve the bankruptcy of India to abstain from doing so, but because it is the right thing to do. It is a condition of Indian administration that the natural tendency towards the growth of expenditure in all branches of the service should be subject to a restraint much less feeble in action than is at work under even a parliamentary government. The advocates for efficient, that is expensive, administration are many and strong-voiced; those responsible for economy are few. The constant change of rulers tends in the same direction; while—and this is a very important factor in the case—the rate of expenditure in India is often at the mercy of those who are no way responsible for its good government. A decision of the War Office or a resolution of the House of Commons may have the effect of saddling India with a charge from which relief can be got only when public attention is specially aroused. So that these financial scares, although a crude and often extravagant way of bringing about economy, have their use. Just as an outbreak of fever sets us to look after our drainage, so it is at such a time as the present that the radical changes of system can be effected by which alone real economies are possible, because public opinion then comes to the reformer's aid. And I will submit, in conclusion, a few suggestions on this head, premising that this is not the place to deal with those economies in details in which so much financial virtue is to be found.<sup>1</sup>

A word should first be said about the home charges, which some people seem to think are specially susceptible of reduction. The bulk of these is for the interest on the debt, which cannot be touched. Nor can the dividends on railway capital be reduced till the different contracts fall in. And when people speak of these home charges as if they were a grievous drain on India, it may be remembered that India has received in return for a large part of it the outlay of an enormous amount of English capital, which has gone to raise wages and to create new trades and industries unknown there before, and has had an extraordinarily beneficial effect on the

(1) The cost of stationery and printing, for example, has increased during the last twelve years from about £260,000 to more than half a million. Printing in India is ludicrously overdone.

condition of the people. For every other poor country it is considered a great advantage to obtain the aid of English capital, nor is India any exception to the rule. And as regards the whole of this "tribute," it may certainly be affirmed that if India could have obtained the advantages of peace and a settled government, and a system of railways and canals, without paying for them, it would be still better off than it is; whether, notwithstanding what it has to pay, it has lost or gained by the bargain, each man must judge for himself. But one may fairly protest against the assumption often made, that there is some particular tribute which would be equitable; as, for example, that the seventeen millions should be cut down by two or three. The home charges on which reductions are possible, apart from minor items which cannot be touched on here, arise out of the organization of the Indian army and the Indian services, and it is only through a change in these that reduction can be looked for. The payment in England merely represents the result of the policy in force for conducting the government of India.

Turning now to the expenditure in that country. And first, as regards public works. We have hitherto been considering those which involve a charge for interest. But what are called "ordinary" works are paid for out of the revenues of the year; and if they can be reduced immediate relief will follow. They have been largely cut down already. Ten years ago the charge was more than six millions; it is less than five millions now. Five millions seems a large sum, but it comprises a great variety of items, and when these are examined it will be found that, after providing for services absolutely necessary, the maintenance of the roads, embankments, and tanks, the public buildings, civil and military, all over that great country, the balance left available on which alone any sensible reduction can be effected is not large. Still, a reduction of this balance will give immediate relief, and this can and will no doubt be carried out.

The cost of education has doubled during the last twelve years, and now figures in the estimates for a million. Placed as the Indian Government is now, a grant so large certainly savours of luxury. Immediate reduction is here impossible; the figures represent obligations already incurred; but it is quite within the power of the State to reduce the expenditure largely in the future, and in the opinion of many this might be done without at all impairing the quality of the education imparted, which would be more valued also if more was paid for it. If in this, as in all other branches of expenditure, we could only get back to the scale of ten years ago, the financial difficulty would disappear.

The maintenance of the separate Presidencies of Madras and Bombay, with all the apparatus of councils and commanders-in-chief

and the attached establishments, appears defensible only on the ground that the arrangement exists and would take trouble to alter. It came about by accident in the first instance, and sooner or later will beyond doubt be replaced by a system more economical and convenient. The present distribution of the Indian forces in three armies, by which troops stationed in provinces under the orders of the supreme Government belong to what is called the Madras establishment, is clumsy to the last degree and needlessly expensive. If it be said that this separation has the merit of preventing over-centralisation of the native troops, it may be replied that the same end may be otherwise accomplished at far less cost and friction, and that decentralisation is not carried nearly far enough, and cannot be so long as these obsolete Presidency distinctions are maintained.

But the saving to be got by a recasting of the form of Indian administration, although considerable, will not go far to getting rid of a large deficit, and the force of the financial disturbance must be very great to overcome the inertia of prejudice and long association which will be opposed to the change. To effect large reductions a large expenditure must be dealt with. The army estimates have increased during the last ten years—1869 to 1878—by about half a million, mainly in non-effective services, for higher pensions, and more officers in the superior grades, the effective establishment being substantially the same. Now no one who has any practical acquaintance with the circumstances will venture to look forward to any considerable reduction of numbers. For the work it has to do and the extent of country it has to occupy, the Indian army is extremely small. Any possible saving can be looked for only by an improved organization. As regards the native army, the reduction of European officers has probably been carried to the lowest point practicable; but the organization of those officers is very expensive. There is not, as in all other armies, a fixed proportion of officers in each grade, arranged with reference to the duties to be performed; promotion is by length of service, and the result being that in all branches there are men much too old for their position, field officers doing subalterns' work but receiving field officers' pay. The disproportion between the numbers of the senior and junior ranks is enormous. Superannuation is not enforced, and the rules do not favour voluntary retirements. While the rates of pension are small, to every officer is held out the inducement to hold on, by the certainty of succeeding, after a fixed term of years, to the valuable "colonel's allowance," which in the British service is only given as a special reward. Hence the increase to the non-effective charges, which will continue rather than diminish. As regards the officers now in the service these favourable terms must be maintained; but one way of obtaining partial relief is available. In every other army, when an officer retires on a pen-



sion, promotions are made in his room, so that the effective charge remains the same, and there is also a pension in addition; but in the Indian staff corps promotion does not follow a vacancy. A colonel retires and a lieutenant succeeds him. The difference in their rates of pay would, therefore, cover the pension of the former, and leave a saving. In this way it might be possible to reduce the military charges appreciably, with a positive increase of efficiency, by raising the pension rates, and thus inducing officers to retire without waiting for the colonel's allowance. Of course this is a saving only in the sense of substituting for an extravagant arrangement one that is less so, just as a man who has to keep up more servants than he can afford, by putting them on board wages saves the cost of an extravagant servants' hall. But the evils of the present system may be avoided for the future by regimenting the officers with the native troops, and combining with the introduction of more judicious pension rules a system of compulsory retirement, so as to prevent the accumulation of an excessive number of highly paid seniors.

Another way of saving is to be found in a reorganization of the British forces. India has been sacrificed to the supposed exigencies of England and to the desire to obtain a symmetrical organization. The principle laid down being that there should be an equal number of battalions serving abroad and at home, India has had to take the required number of men in the form of an excessive number of weak battalions. The result is that when the Indian army takes the field these battalions at the very outset of the campaign give each a mere handful of men, yet each unit is loaded with the charge for a colonel and full depot at home, and all the appurtenances sufficient for a much stronger body. Weak cadres may be very well when the means exist for filling them up on an emergency, but from the nature of the case these are wanting in India, and for the needs of that country the existing force should take the form of a much smaller number of stronger battalions, such as used to be serving there in the old days of the Company. The present time is very suitable for pressing this change, because it is now plain that this equal distribution of battalions between home and foreign stations leaves England insufficiently provided to meet any sudden demand, and that a larger number of battalions are wanted for the home reserve. Further, the proposed doubling up of the existing regiments of the line would admit of one of the battalions in India being permanently stationed there, and thus save India from the great expense thrown on it by the short service system. This is quite compatible with maintaining the imperial character of the army; the officers would pass to and fro; the non-commissioned officers would be changed; but the men would spend their twelve years in India, the idea being abandoned of looking for home reserves from the troops serving there.

Further, the new system of promotion and retirement should eventually render it unnecessary to saddle the battalions in India with the dead weight of colonels or with more than a very small cost for depots, which confer no strength on India, and have been multiplied solely in English interests. Analogous arrangements are needed for the artillery and cavalry.

These changes would probably meet with great opposition, and would need great energy and persistence to carry through ; but it is only in some such way that a sensible reduction of Indian army expenditure can be looked for.

I have elsewhere ventured to express my opinion that the European agency in India is overdone, and that it would be equally for the interests of the members of the service themselves and of the finances that it should be largely reduced. But the financial saving from this can only be prospective. Reductions involve large outlay for compensation ; what this change will effect is to stave off the impending increase for home and other charges which will otherwise certainly accrue. One more suggestion will here be offered which may be of practical value. Hitherto reductions in India have usually taken the form of dismissing office establishments and the subordinate officials who cannot make themselves heard ; the English officials appointed from home serve under the prescriptive understanding that they shall not be got rid of without their own consent. It was under this understanding that after the army reductions of 1861 several hundred officers were retained on full pay for whom no employment could be found. And the difference between Indian pay and Indian pensions is so great that there is always a difficulty in getting men to retire of their own accord. I believe it would be found of great practical use, as making the service more elastic, if the emoluments of Indian service were more evenly distributed between the times of employment and retirement. In this view I would propose that a large percentage of every man's salary should take the form of deferred pay, to be credited with compound interest—principal and interest being payable only on retirement or death. A reduction of this sort is made from the Civil Service—although the repayment is made in a clumsy, inequitable way, and it is practically only in this branch of the service that retirements ever take place without special inducements being offered. I believe that to enforce frugality in this way among the European services would be most acceptable to those concerned ; while only in some such way will it be possible, not to reduce the home charges, but to prevent that serious increase of them for pensions in the future which otherwise must inevitably arise, to add to the already existing difficulties of Indian finance.

GEORGE CHESNEY.

## A FEW WORDS ON MR. DILLWYN'S MOTION.

THE historiographer upon whom the mantle of Mr. Theodore Martin may some day fall will not fail to point the moral of Mr. Dillwyn's motion. In keeping with some examples to be found in the work of his accomplished predecessor, he will describe the attempts which were then made by an obscure faction to inflame the public mind respecting alleged abuses of the royal prerogative, and he will add with faltering pen that party spirit, then deplorably rampant, did not hesitate to assail the Queen. He will tell how calumny flourished, and constitutional sciolists had it all their own way till they ventured to repeat their idle stories and air their shallow sophistries in the House of Commons, when they experienced an ignominious collapse. Mr. Dillwyn and Mr. Courtney are not likely to figure to advantage in that recital. It will probably be said that they were afraid of their own shadows, and turned round in the hope of escaping them. Mr. Fawcett will be cited as proof that even the Radicals were ashamed of their friends, while Mr. Gladstone may possibly be arrayed in some grotesque airs of repentance. The Constitution may by that time have reached so remote a point in its inverse development as to admit of its being shown that, next to Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Robert Montagu was its wisest seer. But the honours of the day will be reserved for Sir Stafford Northcote, who will shine forth as Ithuriel, or the champion saint of England, or some other mythical worthy renowned for detecting impostures or slaying dragons. So much may be anticipated; but as for the accompaniments of the picture, the quiet scorn, the composed and superior wisdom, the disdainful pity, these must be left to the appreciation of the future.

As an excuse proffered, let us hope, half a century beforehand, it must be admitted that the events of the evening would easily lend themselves to satirical description. There was something pathetic in Mr. Dillwyn's sudden change of front as soon as he found that his motion was supposed to reflect upon the Queen. Mr. Courtney played the part of Dunning, and it will be in pleasant harmony with historical precedent if he and Mr. Dillwyn are raised to the peerage a couple of years hence. The House not being in Committee, the Speaker could not follow the example of Sir Fletcher Norton by making a fiery speech against the Crown. The exposure of the innocent little plot which had been contrived for burking the debate revealed a unanimous desire to escape the necessity of any distinct avowal of opinion on an unpleasant topic. Mr. Fawcett's amendment

exactly hit the mark, for, though there were ample grounds for suspicion, there was no proof, the documents being in the hands of defendant's counsel ; but even that was dropped, perhaps because it would have compelled plain speaking. No great debate can be carried on unless the leading men of both parties are willing to take part in it, and it was utterly unreasonable to expect them to do so on such an occasion, except for the defence. The obvious unwillingness of the House to discuss the subject was itself a phenomenon of rare political significance. But there was a sufficient reason for their reluctance, and one eminently deserving of respect, as all sufficient reasons are. No change of words could purge the motion of its primal taint, and we may be quite sure that the personal acts of the sovereign will never be discussed in the House of Commons till we are on the eve of grave events.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said of Mr. Dillwyn's motion, that it was "of the most vague and uncertain character, and, like a very Proteus, changed its form at every attempt to grapple with it." The motion then before the House of course had not changed at all, but, taken in connection with the motion which it superseded, and with the speeches made in its support, there might appear to be some ground for the charge. But if a motion made in honest terms by able men can be in the least open to such observations, the fault must be found in the subject dealt with, and this, perhaps, may bear a little unravelling.

In the first place, whatever meaning Mr. Dillwyn may have intended to convey by the terms of his original motion, it is necessary frankly to admit that the acts shadowed forth in it, and assumed to have been done, were personal acts of the Queen. They were the sending, on several occasions, by the Queen in her own name, of letters and telegrams to eminent persons who were then employed abroad in the service of the Crown. For aught that appeared, these letters were written by the Queen on her personal authority, without the advice and even without the knowledge of her Ministers. To have made such an assumption might have justified Sir Stafford Northcote's taunt about "an insinuation of malice," and a disposition "to put the worst construction" upon acts capable of being explained in an innocent sense, if the replies given by Ministers when questioned on the subject in the House of Commons had not shown that the assumption was in several cases correct. I waive for the moment all question as to the contents and purport of these communications. The important point is that they should have been sent at all. When sovereigns send messages to public servants, it is to be presumed that something of consequence will be said, and when they are sent at critical junctures, just, perhaps, when the person to whom they are addressed is hesitating between the letter of his

## A FEW WORDS ON MR. DILLWYN'S MOTION.

instructions and his own inclination to go further, a word from the sovereign may have results of incalculable importance. Such acts may be all that Mr. Dillwyn suggested. They may amount to "direct interference" in the policy of the country, in which case they would deserve to be censured as unconstitutional, were it possible to censure them. In any case they have the appearance of unconstitutionality, and may easily become the vehicle of unconstitutional procedure. They are irregular, and therefore wrong; and it was certainly an inference capable of being drawn from the terms of Mr. Dillwyn's original motion that he wished the House to affirm this conclusion.

But here arises a difficulty which Mr. Courtney duly emphasises. It is unconstitutional for the Queen to interfere in matters of policy without the advice or even the knowledge of her Ministers, but it is also unconstitutional to pass any censure upon the Queen. The one is as bad as the other. There is the famous maxim, "The king can do no wrong." As words are usually understood, this is of course a fiction, but it is turned from a fiction into a fact by being made a rule of constitutional procedure. It is the rule our forefathers have laid down, and the moment we abandon it, constitutional monarchy is at an end with us. A sovereign always liable to be censured by his subjects could not long reign with dignity; that is, he could not reign at all. As Mr. Courtney observed, "a vote of censure on the Crown is an absurdity, because such a vote would contradict the principle that the Crown is above responsibility." Absurd it is, but it is an artificial absurdity. It is absurd because we have agreed to establish a principle with which it is incompatible, and it is necessary to adhere to this view so long as we wish to reconcile royalty, and especially hereditary royalty, with popular government. In framing his original motion, Mr. Dillwyn went straight to the mark, and deserves praise for his courage. A little more of that quality would not injure the character of the House of Commons. But on further reflection, aided, perhaps, by the comments of those who could judge of his intentions only by the apparent tenor of his words, he found that he had sent his arrows too far, and thought it well to make it clearer that he wished to fly them at the good old constitutional butt. Thus altered, the motion became in form as well as in intention one of censure upon Ministers, and as they could only be censured for acts proved to have been their own, the fire of censure ran along the file of delinquencies which the Opposition have been censuring and a victorious majority condoning for the last four years. Thus the formal object of the debate strayed leagues away from the mark really aimed at. To make confusion worse confounded, the speeches of the mover and seconder, while avowedly aimed at the new mark, really kept true to the old one. So there

were two issues ; the formal was not the real issue, and the real issue could not be avowed because of constitutional impossibilities ; though, as these impossibilities are only matters of convention, when Mr. Courtney pitched nature out of the door, she managed to steal back again into his speech. Throughout the debate everybody understood everybody, but in the contention between fact and fiction, between art and nature, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was able to say that he found the issue incomprehensible, and could not be expected to grapple with Proteus.

Mr. Dillwyn's original motion was, as I have said, provoked by certain acts which appeared to have been done by the Queen herself, without the advice, and even without the knowledge of her Ministers ; and the motion in its revised form, though Mr. Courtney held it to mean precisely what it did before revision, was substantially a motion of censure on her Ministers. Surely, it may be said, there is a lack of logic and justice in the transition from the subject-matter of the indictment to the persons actually indicted. With what show of justice can Ministers be blamed for advising, for example, the writing of a letter to Lady Frere, when as a matter-of-fact they did not advise it, and knew nothing of it. Surely here is an instance in which, if the thing itself was wrong, the Queen herself did the wrong, and her Ministers are blameless. Surely here is a case for which the Constitution has failed to provide, and in respect of which the nation may be seriously injured without being able to apply a remedy. But the apparent anomaly vanishes when we take into account the real dimensions of Ministerial responsibility, and remember that if it has its duties it has also corresponding rights. The doctrine that the Queen can do no wrong, and the explanatory assumption that she can do nothing without the advice of Ministers, would be absurd if they were not supplemented by this other maxim, that it is both the right and the duty of Ministers to disallow anything which may have been done without their knowledge, and to take good care that nothing of the kind shall be done again. It does not fall within their duty to lay any prohibition upon the sovereign, but they are masters of themselves, and if their advice on matters of constitutional discipline is not listened to, they can resign. If they hesitate to take this step ; if they prefer to connive at irregularities, and to tolerate, condone, and perhaps encourage repeated aggressions on their sphere of duty, they may win the short-sighted favour of the Crown, but they will really betray both the Crown and the country.

This is the principle which reconciles the first of Mr. Dillwyn's motions with the second, and makes their meaning identical. This is the principle which supplies the constitutional *nexus* between complaints founded upon the personal acts of the sovereign, and a motion

of censure upon her Ministers. Mr. Courtney illustrated the principle with reference to a most important point in constitutional practice, namely, the character to be ascribed to the political acts of the sovereign during a Ministerial interregnum. When a "Ministerial crisis" is decently managed, there is no interregnum, the retiring Ministers holding office down to the moment when their successors are appointed, in which case the staff of responsibility is handed on from one set to the other. But when the sovereign peremptorily dismisses his Ministers, as William IV. did, there will be an interval during which the Crown may appear to be served by no responsible Minister, and to be acting for itself. In the instance just mentioned the interregnum was of no long duration, for though Sir Robert Peel, the destined premier, was on his travels, the Duke of Wellington, who was at once called, took the whole burden of the State upon his shoulders. So that even then there was a Minister who could be sent to the Tower if necessary. But, to make assurance doubly sure, as Mr. Courtney has pointed out, when Sir Robert Peel took office, he "accepted the responsibility of everything that had been done in the interval between his accession to office and the dismissal of Lord Melbourne," thereby proving that not even in the most extreme case which can be imagined, and therefore under no circumstances, "is it possible for the Crown to commit an act which can be the subject of censure or blame." This is not merely reasonable doctrine, it is necessary doctrine, and it is easily applied. An incoming premier, in order to justify his own acceptance of office, must acquaint himself with the circumstances in which the offer is made, including all that has been done since the office became vacant, and his acceptance of office thus becomes a guarantee to the nation, that to the best of his judgment and conscience everything has been rightly done. But Ministerial responsibility not only covers the whole chronological series of the acts of the Crown; it equally covers the whole of its contemporary acts. No group can escape cognisance by being marked "private." Private relations do not need to be defined, but there can be no private relations between the Crown and one of its servants with respect to the public duties which he is employed in discharging. All the business transacted with such an official, every communication made to him respecting the service in which he is employed, is a public matter, and should be done not merely through, but by, the responsible Ministers of the Crown. It ought to be none of our concern to see that this rule is observed. Our concern on that head can only be justified when it cannot be repressed, when it is involuntarily aroused by notorious and palpable indications of neglect. Then we may be forced to speak, but if there should prove to have been any real ground for our interference, it can only be because Ministers have failed in their duty.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer informs us that by the British constitution the sovereign is not "a mere dummy." That is quite true; but the word is used invidiously, and is mere caricature. It is not proper to describe by such a word the faithful discharge of any set of duties, even of the humblest kind, to say nothing of those which are most exalted. It is one of the highest offices of reason in every man to ascertain the laws which ought to control his action in the position in which he is placed, and to yield to them a prompt and cheerful obedience. It is not an all-devouring and aggressive activity that men praise most, or that is held to show wisdom. The sovereign of these realms fills a wonderfully august position; but for manifold reasons, absolutely peremptory in their character, and obvious to any one who chooses to reflect, it has been found necessary to restrain his personal will from entering into the sphere of government. Putting aside the language of fiction, his servants are chosen for him, and as it is they alone whom the nation can reach if things go wrong, it is they alone who can do anything. Of what passes between the sovereign and his Ministers we are not supposed to hear a word, nor is it necessary that we should; the responsibility of the latter covers the whole ground, and it rests with them to make their position tolerable.

If there were any act of a constructively public character which the sovereign might do without having recourse to her Ministers, or which her ministers, out of consideration for the sovereign, might permit themselves to tolerate, it would surely be the writing of such a letter as the Queen wrote to Lady Frere. But this very instance proves the salutary nature of the rule which it infringed. The letter was written to a lady; but the lady was the wife of the High Commissioner set over the South African colonies, and at that moment in the thick of the Zulu war. He had entered upon that war without instructions. Without any authorisation he had made demands upon Cetywayo which were meant to be rejected, and the rejection of which supplied the excuse wanted for beginning the war. He began the war with inadequate forces, the result being a series of disgraceful and bloody disasters. The nation was filled with distress at the slaughter of so many brave men; but it felt still more keenly the outrage offered to the public conscience by the cynical immorality of Sir Bartle Frere's proceedings. The Government bent before the storm. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach wrote a severe censure, disallowed the demands made upon Cetywayo, and put an end to the scheme for annexing Zululand. At that moment the Queen's letter was sent to Lady Frere, sympathising with her "noble-minded husband" in his difficulties. What else the letter contained we do not know; but it at once went forth as news that the Queen had taken sides with Sir Bartle Frere in his quarrel with



the Government, and that, though Sir Michael Hicks-Beach censured, her Majesty approved. The colonists took the hint at once, and in crowded meetings everywhere declared for the Queen and Sir Bartle Frere, and denounced the policy of the Government. The effect of the Queen's communication upon Sir Bartle Frere himself can only be inferred from the common principles of human nature. He cannot be incorrigibly insubordinate; but he has enormous power in his hands, and what he determines to do will probably be done. He knows he has his sovereign's sympathies, and may perhaps mistakenly infer that she approves of the very policy which has been officially censured. He is a sagacious and bold man. He can weigh as well as count his employers, and is probably by this time giving effect to the conviction that, with the Queen to back him, he need not fear the simulated wrath of the Colonial Office. It is in the order of things that we should hear of further reinforcements being sent out, and the odds are that Zululand will be annexed in spite of Sir M. Hicks-Beach. When the war is over, a peerage will reward the labours of the "noble-minded" man, and every public servant of the Crown will be taught by a brilliant example that obedience to the Queen's Ministers is not always the path which leads to honour and fame.

The irregularities which were the immediate occasion of Mr. Dillwyn's motion, and the undue use which has been made of the prerogative by the Ministers of the Crown, have one and the same explanation. I am heartily tired of Baron Stockmar's constitutional theories, and of the political speculations of Disraeli the Younger, but, at the same time, it is requisite to admit that the recognition of facts is not so much a matter of taste as of eyesight. The "vigorous constitutional essay" which is published in the second volume of the *Life of the Prince Consort*, and the "Vindication of the English Constitution," from which Mr. Courtney quoted largely in his speech, agree in many essential points; and on the supposition that the doctrines they expound have served as the basis of the advice which has lately been offered to the Crown, all that has raised our indignation and whetted our suspicions during the last five years would be explained. The dominant idea of the Coburg and Hughenden sages is that the Crown should regain the freedom it possessed before the Cabinet was separated from the Privy Council, and the principle of Ministerial responsibility assumed its modern form. If the views they have advocated were carried out, the Crown would again take the initiative in policy and legislation. Its Ministers would be in a literal sense its servants, eager to catch its inspirations, and to give effect to them in the management of affairs. As regards Parliament, the Crown would revive its "dormant prerogatives;" as regards the nation, it would seek to dazzle the popular imagination, and to attach all classes to its interests by extending its influence in all sorts of ways.

By adroitly using opportunities as they arose, and steadfastly holding on to a policy of reactionary innovation, the sovereign would soon cease to resemble Baron Stockmar's "nodding Mandarin," or Mr. Disraeli's "Venetian Doge," or Sir Stafford Northcote's "mere dummy." The Crown would again become a formidable and independent power, leaning upon the peers as its natural allies, and holding the democracy in check. From Mr. Disraeli's point of view, the democracy has always been regarded as manageable. All it wants is drugging. Intoxicate it with draughts of imperialism, and it may be led anywhere and made to do anything.

Under any approach to such a system, however slight and tentative, the responsibility of Ministers would soon become a mere stage-word, to be mouthed when inconvenient inquiries had to be warded off, or an opponent silenced. Instead of representing the collective decisions of the Cabinet, it would soon come to signify a working agreement that what any of them had done all the rest should swear to if a joint avowal became necessary. This *ex post facto* responsibility, beginning with the gravest, would naturally be extended to the smallest matters. If the sovereign exercised the right of initiation, the fewer who were intrusted with the secret the better, the rest being told so much as it was safe for them to know. If one of these outsiders had to answer a question in the House of Commons on the subject of the secret, he would be likely to say what it afterwards might be necessary to modify or recall. But that would be of little consequence. Better to confound a colleague and mislead the House than risk a premature revelation. The system of communicating with distant servants of the Crown by means of private letters easily lends itself to the conveniences of a Cabinet in a state of disintegration. While public dispatches convey one set of instructions, a few lines sent, perhaps, from another source may neutralise so much of them as is objectionable to the paramount power. Responsibility, in any effective sense of the word, depends upon collective discussion and collective action, a mode of procedure which there are many reasons for believing that the present Cabinet has discarded. We want responsibility, not morely that we may have a word to bandy with, nor even that there may be somebody to be dismissed or hanged, but as a practical guarantee to the country that it shall be committed to no policy which has not been adopted after full and joint deliberation. But even these precautions for securing a wise decision will be defeated if the independence of the Cabinet is not fortified by the independence of its members, and if all are got rid of except those who are willing to become the Premier's tools.

The fourth volume of the *Life of the Prince Consort* throws some further light on these questions. It is pleasant to come upon the earliest traces of Lord Beaconsfield's loyal assiduity. Mr. Courtney,

quoting from Sir Erskine May, recalled the fact that "Parliament had established for centuries the constitutional doctrine that the King should not hear or give credit to reports of its debates," whereas Lord Barrington was at that moment occupied in taking down notes of Mr. Courtney's speech for transmission to Windsor. When Mr. Disraeli was leader of the House in 1859, it was he who performed the duty of sending to the Queen a nightly report of the debates. A short extract or two will show how he discharged it. "A night of immense power and excitement"—the debate was on the second reading of the Tory Reform Bill. "Two of the greatest speeches ever delivered in Parliament, by Sir Edward Lytton and the Solicitor-General" (now Lord Cairns). "Deaf, fantastic, modulating his voice with difficulty, sometimes painful, at first almost an object of ridicule to the superficial, Lytton occasionally reached even the sublime, and perfectly enchained his audience. His description of the English Constitution, his analysis of democracy, as rich and more powerful than Burke." The Queen was informed in the same dispatch that Sir Hugh Cairns spoke with "a concinnity which none can equal," and, "having literally demolished the mover of the amendment, sat down amid universal cheers." Whatever may be thought of the propriety of sending these nightly reports to the Queen, it will perhaps be considered that this one-sided style of characterisation goes a little too far. A night or two later Mr. Disraeli informed her Majesty that Lord Palmerston had used language "infinitely audacious." He had talked of stopping the supplies, in order to force Ministers to resign or dissolve. It is really beautiful to see Mr. Disraeli acting as the Queen's Own Reporter, and pouring all his wealth of rhetoric and pomp of diction at her Majesty's feet. And yet how colloquial he contrives to be withal, how confidential, how almost tender! The most artful flattery must yield in seductiveness to such simple and guileless service.

It is commonly thought that in matters of policy and legislation the Crown acts upon the advice of Ministers, and does not pretend to the right of dictation and control. Such a doctrine seems to have been obsolete at Windsor twenty years ago. It would even appear that in the opinion of the Prince the understood relation should be inverted, and that instead of the Crown acting on the advice of Ministers, it was the business of Ministers to act upon the advice of the Crown. Writing to Stockmar at Coburg in 1857, the Prince says: "Our military organizations for averting disasters so great are quite inadequate, and we have to bully and extort what is necessary from the Ministry bit by bit." Writing about the same time to the present German Emperor, he remarks: "The English public is calm and composed, the Ministry too calm for my notions, and therefore we are constantly digging our spurs into their sides." The sole reason

for this bullying and extorting and digging in of spurs was that the Prince wanted a larger army than the Government considered necessary. On the question of reducing our armaments at the close of the Crimean war, and of not raising them sufficiently a year later, in order to be prepared against an attack from France, the Prince and the Cabinet were in constant feud. Lord Clarendon was always his sympathising friend. When the Queen wrote a letter to the Cabinet to back the Prince's admonitions, Lord Clarendon writes that he has "read it with melancholy satisfaction," and promises to do everything in his power to induce his colleagues to follow the advice therein tendered. Of our policy with France the Queen and Prince seem to have assumed the entire control, though their slippery friend, the Emperor, was always deceiving them. The end of it all was that the Emperor believed that the Prince was helping to organize a European coalition against him, and that the Prince believed that the Emperor was meditating the invasion of England. The Prince carried the day in a struggle with Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell upon the Italian question, for the Queen forced them to summon a meeting of the whole Cabinet, at that time scattered for the holidays, and the rank and file outvoted their chiefs. What Lord Clarendon had been in Lord Palmerston's Government, General Peel was in Lord Derby's. "He is a pearl in the Ministry," writes the Prince to Stockmar; "for he is fearless, and holds the service of the Crown to be his first duty." By the bringing out of particular episodes, a partial impression may be conveyed, but the fact seems to be that the Prince's life was one of incessant warfare with the advisers of the Crown, and that the proceedings in Parliament often filled him with despair. "Parliament is prorogued at last!" he exclaims in one of his letters. "My blessing go with it!" The Queen once wrote to Lord Palmerston telling him what she would have said on a particular occasion if she had been in the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston, who had grown hardy in the strife, presented his humble duty to her Majesty, and begged to express his sense of the enormous disadvantage he would have had to encounter if her Majesty had figured in the ranks of the Opposition. But Lord Palmerston was a statesman of the old school; he had many defects, but at least he was unfitted to yield readily to the new influences which were then at work, and his sense of what was due to the position of an English Premier has some resemblance to a decaying tradition.

Four years ago a journal of repute—I think it was the *Pall Mall Gazette*—assured us in its leading columns, that "we are at present living under a political system of the Prince Consort's invention." This fact it considered at that time to be "abundantly proved." Fuller information has since made it clear that the Prince was not the inventor of the system, but that he borrowed it from his German

master and friend, his Mentor, his intellectual second self. This also admits of being "abundantly proved." In the opinion of the above-named journal, the "political system" under which we were living four years ago had been "much impaired" since the Prince's death; but the considerations referred to in Mr. Courtney's speech, corroborated as they have been by so many recent facts, lead irresistibly to the conclusion that any dilapidations it underwent between 1861 and 1874 have since been made good, and that it is now being worked under specially favourable auspices. Twenty years ago the establishment of the system was a matter of daily toil and conflict, which brought the Prince into collision with statesmen of both parties. Now it seems to have been quietly accepted, and instead of signs of war there is every indication, as lovers say, of reciprocal affection between the once hostile powers. Time has been favourable to the elective affinities; whether time has any shocks in store for them we must wait to see.

As regards the humble part which I have taken in the discussion of this subject, my sole aim has been to raise a voice of warning against dangers which may possibly befall us in the future if the principles of the newly invented political system are allowed to develop themselves unchecked, believing that mischievous tendencies are more easily dealt with in their beginnings than after they have gathered strength enough to be really formidable. It may be said that there is not the smallest reason for suspicion, and that nothing but the densest ignorance of history and an utter unacquaintance with practical politics could lead any one to imagine the existence of constitutional perils at the present time. Such glib assurances have never been wanting, not even at periods which everybody now admits to have been dangerous to freedom. They were uttered with just as much confidence a century ago, and the answer they drew from a great man supplies me with a sufficient vindication. "No complaisance to our Court or to our age," says Burke, "can make me believe nature to be so changed but that public liberty will be among us, as among our ancestors, obnoxious to some person or other; and that opportunities will be furnished for attempting at least some alteration to the prejudice of our Constitution. These attempts will naturally vary in their mode, according to times and circumstances. For ambition, although it has ever the same general views, has not at all times the same means, nor the same particular objects. . . . Every age has its own manners and its politics dependent upon them, and the same attempts will not be made against a Constitution fully formed and matured that were made to destroy it in the cradle, or to resist its growth during its infancy."<sup>1</sup>

HENRY DUNCKLEY.

(1) "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents."

## MALTA.

OF the fifty or more colonies and foreign possessions that England has acquired by fair means or foul, Malta is one of the smallest, and, in some respects, one of the least important. It does not, like our Canadian and Australian dominions, offer any refuge to our redundant population, or afford to people of our own kin any opportunity for vexing us with their experiments in democratic government or economic legislation. We have not in it, as in the West Indies or in South Africa, to deal with inferior races, imported or indigenous, whom we deem it necessary to force into our service or to kill out of our path. Nor—though here, in a very small way, the problem is somewhat similar—is it, like India, inhabited by millions over whom we have obtained absolute authority for our own advantage, thereby assuming the responsibility, none the less weighty because it is barely recognised, of giving them all the enlightenment and prosperity we can. At the same time our holding of it is different from that of Gibraltar, which is hardly more than a fortress, or of Hong Kong, which is practically to us only an armed custom-house. It has a native population, inordinately large for its dimensions, who have placed themselves under our protection, and whose interests we are bound to look after for our own sake, as well as for theirs; and the conditions under which we administer their affairs are sufficiently distinct, and the political and social problems involved are important enough, to be worth examining.

To understand the nature of our rule in Malta and the neighbouring island of Gozo, it is necessary to bear in mind the terms on which they came into our hands nearly eighty years ago, and what was the state of their inhabitants at that time. Of tolerably pure Arabic origin, as they appear to have been, though bearing traces of the earlier race whom their ancestors displaced and partly mixed with, as well as of the Norman and Italian settlers whom their connection with Sicily brought among them, the Maltese were probably at first gainers by the establishment of the Order of St. John in their island. They soon came to be little better than serfs, at the mercy of their tyrants, and obtaining such privileges as were conceded to them only by submitting to degradations, which naturally, under a dissolute army of celibate knights, fell most heavily upon their wives and daughters. Even if other evidence were wanting, there would be sufficient proof of the effects of knightly interference with family relations in the contrasts of physique and temperament among various groups of Maltese at the

present day, and especially in the difference between many natives of Malta itself and their more thoroughly Arabic kinsmen in Gozo.

Matters were not greatly mended by the dependence that the people, hardly used by the Order, learnt to place in the Church, which, except at rare intervals, was always more or less at feud with it. The protection they thus gained was another sort of bondage, and one that was not shaken off by the overthrow of the military tyranny. That tyranny, of course, declined with the decay of the Order. Many favours were shown to the Maltese. They were allowed a slender form of self-government by the revival of their ancient *Consiglio Popolare*. Municipal affairs, under dictation, were intrusted to local magnates in Valetta and the townships. To prominent families, in reward for soldiership and other services, the rank of nobility was accorded, and prosperous traders were permitted to enjoy and bequeath the wealth they had acquired. For the needy charities were endowed, though among these Magdalen asylums and foundling hospitals, to which both priests and knights could recommend their favourites, were suspiciously numerous. Codes of laws for the administration of justice were prepared, and native magistrates were appointed to enforce them. Thus the Maltese, steadily increasing in numbers, attained a measure of comfort before Von Hompesch, the last Grand Master of the degenerate Order, surrendered the island to Bonaparte in 1798. It is true that all their so-called privileges and rights were to the last held on sufferance, and were in the nature of favours bestowed on a subject race, rather than of prerogatives earned by free men.

The greatest concession ever made by the Knights of St. John to the people was when Grand Master von Hompesch permitted some of their representatives to join with him in signing the articles of capitulation, by which, in 1798, Malta and Gozo were handed over to the French, and in which it was provided that "the inhabitants shall be allowed, as of old, the free exercise of the Catholic, apostolic, and holy Roman religion, their privileges and property shall remain inviolate, and they shall not be subject to any extraordinary taxes." That pledge was broken as soon as it was given. During their brief occupation of the islands, or so much of them as they could hold against the insurgent people, the French indulged in all the robbery and cruelty in their power. But it was an implied condition of the eager acquiescence of the Maltese in the expulsion of the French by Captain, afterwards Sir, Alexander Ball, on behalf of England and the Allies, in 1800, that he should endorse and keep the promises which Bonaparte, merely for form's sake, had made. Those promises were substantially repeated more than once during the fourteen years in which Malta was held and irregularly looked after by the English, before it was formally ceded to them by the

**Treaty of Paris.** In anticipation of that arrangement, when Sir Thomas Maitland assumed the government in 1813, he issued a proclamation pledging the Prince Regent and his successors "to recognise the people of Malta and Gozo as subjects of the British Crown; to secure to the Maltese in the fullest manner the free exercise of their religion; to maintain their ecclesiastical establishment; to introduce such amelioration in the proceedings of the courts of law as will secure to every one the certainty of speedy and effective justice; to make such improvement in the laws themselves as past experience or change of circumstances may have rendered necessary; and, in short, to adopt every measure that may be requisite to secure to the inhabitants a full share of that happiness, wealth, security, and prosperity fortunately enjoyed by all the subjects of the British empire in every part of the world." That proclamation, rather rhetorical and Utopian in some of its phrases, is regarded by the Maltese as their *Magna Charta*.

Having once obtained possession of the island which nearly three centuries before had been granted to the Order of St. John to be held by it as a barrier against Turkish encroachments upon Christendom, and which, greatly strengthened and improved since then, was considered to be the most formidable fortress in the Mediterranean, the English certainly would not have given it up voluntarily to any other people, and least of all to the Maltese, who would have been powerless to hold it against any invader. Still it is satisfactory to remember that, having been invited by the inhabitants to wrest it from the French, they had popular sanction for retaining it in their hands. Their acquisition of Malta was more justifiable than a good many other issues of the Napoleonic wars and the Treaty of Paris. Notwithstanding occasional murmurs of sedition and frequent expressions of discontent, moreover, the Maltese have never left it open to doubt that they would rather be members of the British Commonwealth than subjects of any other power. At the same time, complaints have always been made by some of them as to the way in which they were admitted into the British Commonwealth, and, during the years of irregular and ill-defined government by "civil commissioners" and military autocrats which preceded Sir Thomas Maitland's appointment as the first governor of the island, those complaints came with special force from the patriots who, while assisting Captain Ball to drive out the French, had been aided by him in the deliberations and appointments of the popular assembly or congress which they convened at Sant' Antonio in 1799. There was never, of course, any question as to the propriety and necessity of England managing in its own way all the military and naval concerns of Malta. Unable to maintain the fortress and its appurtenances for themselves, the Maltese were only too glad that the



English, instead of any other people, should hold it for them; but, knowing that this arrangement was only entered upon by the English for the benefit of England, they considered that, so long as they were loyal to the British Crown, the management of the civil affairs of the island should be left to them.

That was the burden of many petitions and representations which they addressed to the English Government in 1802 and subsequent years. They asked not only for such a revival and expansion of the old *Consiglio Popolare* as would give them free representation in a local parliament, but also for the enjoyment of a free press, of independent tribunals, and of trial by jury. Prominent English statesmen favoured their suit, on the score of political prudence, if not of justice. "We ought," said Lord Melville in the House of Lords in 1803, "to secure to the Maltese a wise and suitable form of civil government, to be enjoyed by them under the protection of the British power. This object ought to be prosecuted and settled without any delay, so that, whenever any new negotiation should be set on foot, we might be enabled to say that the people of Malta, under a form of government agreeable to their wishes, were now established under the protection of Great Britain." But there was no need of such an argument to persuade the other European powers to agree to England's retention of Malta, or even to convince the Maltese themselves that that was the best of the evils they had to choose from, and it was not to be expected that any sense of justice or feeling of generosity would lead the Government to confer on them a larger measure of freedom than was then accorded to Englishmen at home. The petition of the Maltese was refused, and Sir Thomas Maitland was sent out to bestow upon them in a very arbitrary and despotic manner what he supposed to be their "full share of that happiness, wealth, security, and prosperity fortunately enjoyed by all the subjects of the British empire in every part of the world." Had civil liberty, subject only to the general control of the Crown, been then granted to them, they would certainly have stumbled a great deal, but could hardly have committed greater mistakes than those they now suffer from; and they might by this time have acquired the power of wise self-government which comes only by tedious and blundering experience, instead of being, after two generations of paternal rule, still ignorant and wayward children in politics.

The English Government, it must be admitted, has made many efforts to amend this state of things, most notably in the autumn of 1836, when Lord Glenelg commissioned Mr. John Austin, the eminent writer on jurisprudence, and Mr., afterwards Sir, George Cornewall Lewis to visit Malta and to inquire into and report upon its institutions, with a view to "the introduction of a permanent and salutary system of polity, by which the prosperity of the Maltese

nation might be secured, and their interests consolidated with those of Great Britain." Important changes resulted from this proceeding; but, though the commissioners spent a year and a half in the island, their investigations were neither as searching nor as comprehensive as their credentials warranted, and such of their proposals as were adopted, admirable though they were in the main, failed to secure all the benefit that was expected from them. Several great abuses were swept away, and some wholesome rules were adopted; but the ground was not cleared of the pernicious institutions then existing, nor was room afforded for the vigorous growth of any "salutary system of polity."

Some of the bad management was almost inevitable. As it was necessary that England should have absolute control over the military affairs of the island, and as it refused to give the inhabitants any share in the civil government, it had no choice but to exercise a despotic sway; and it was evidently intended that the despotism should be as mild and amiable as it conveniently could be. Sir Thomas Maitland was a man of coarse temper and tyrannical disposition, who provoked much ill-feeling by his rough language and arbitrary acts, but he fairly lived up to his notion of the three main duties imposed upon him. The first of these was to maintain the military importance of Malta; the second, to distribute as many influential offices and large salaries as possible among his friends and dependents; the third, to make the bulk of his Maltese subjects tolerably contented with their lot, while putting his foot on the "turbulent and factious individuals" who sought to lead them astray. All these objects he considered could be best and most easily achieved by reviving, with modifications, the paternal arrangements which the Knights of St. John had established during the later period of their dominion, but which had fallen very much out of gear in the troublous years following the departure of the Order. As the readiest and surest means towards obtaining obedience from the people, he secured the support of the Church by showing it unlimited favour—a course which, within proper bounds, was incumbent upon him in gratitude to the bishops and priests who had zealously preached up the English alliance, and also as part of the contract made over and over again with the people generally. In order to conciliate the local nobility, he conferred upon some of them showy titles and vague functions as lords-lieutenant of the country districts. For the rest, with an appearance of generosity, he undertook to distribute the property of the Knights, except so much as was absolutely needed for military purposes, for the benefit of the people, and to maintain, in slightly altered forms, the systems of revenue collection and expenditure which had formerly existed.

It was in the latter respect that the paternal method pursued by

the English Government and its representatives in Malta reached its fullest development. Under the Order there had been only crude beginnings of municipal government in the island, and what remained of these was quickly stamped out by Sir Thomas Maitland. It had been the policy of the Knights to take on themselves the entire responsibility of grain importation, with the object of storing up in their extensive granaries a sufficient quantity to supply their own wants for many years in the event of a siege, and also to dole it out in ordinary times at fixed prices to the natives. This task was in the eighteenth century relegated to a body of local magnates known as the *università*, which was also intrusted with the dispensing of certain charities. As the *università*, however, ventured, in Sir Thomas Maitland's time, to dabble in politics, he suppressed it, and established in its stead a Board of Supply, in which three English commissioners were to keep up a strict monopoly in the purchase and sale of grain. That preposterous arrangement only lasted a few years. But though the trade, subject to heavy import duties, was soon thrown open, the grain department continued to be the chief caterer for the public, as well as to do all the business for the Government establishments, until it was broken up in 1837 at the recommendation of Messrs. Austin and Lewis, who fixed the tariff at a rate estimated to bring in the same profit to the local exchequer. Since then Malta has continued to derive the largest share of its revenue from wheat, in spite of all the anti-corn-law agitation in England, and under circumstances which, as Mr. Rowsell has pointed out, throw upon the poorer classes of the population half as much taxation again as has to be borne by those who are better off. Whether that is just, or whether the new scheme of taxation proposed by the Colonial Office is practicable, however, need not here be considered. It is sufficient to note this difficulty as one of the unpleasant consequences of the mode of government adopted by the English.

Compelled against his will to abandon the grain monopoly, Sir Thomas Maitland strengthened other institutions of a like sort. As successor to the Knights of St. John, he found himself in possession, according to a vague and perhaps exaggerated estimate, of about one-third of the land and house property in Malta. Part of this property, occupied by fortifications, public buildings, and their surroundings, was required for the defence and control of the island, and has accordingly been ever since retained for those purposes. The rest was made up of a great variety of foundations, held by the Order as a whole, or by its separate "languages," for the performance of all sorts of religious, charitable, and other services. It comprised, in fact, all the philanthropic endowments of Malta, excepting those which the Church kept exclusively in its own hands, and, as nearly

all the government which the Order accorded to the people was in the nature of real or sham benevolence, furnished most of the funds with which it conducted the public, apart from the military, business of the island. The management of this business had recently been left partly, along with the grain monopoly, to the università, and partly to certain *giurati* in various parts of the island. Sir Thomas Maitland, when he got rid of the università, got rid also of the *giurati*, and established instead departments of land revenue and Government works, and committees of charitable institutions, by which their several functions were to be performed. In so doing, he organized a system for humouring the people by diverting to pious and charitable uses, genuine or spurious, a far larger proportion of the revenue than was their share, and, while pauperising the community, contrived to kill all the germs of municipal life that were in it. In the Government departments that he formed, all the highly paid posts were given to Englishmen, but places were found for a quite unnecessary number of Maltese subordinates, who thus became pensioners almost as abject as the recipients of avowed charity. Undertaking to sell wheat to the people, instead of encouraging them to become traders for themselves, the Government also discouraged all other private enterprise and independent labour by making all their roads, digging all their tanks, and building all their houses for them. Sir G. C. Lewis evidently did not exaggerate when he wrote home to his father in December, 1836 :—"The people have contracted such a habit of dependence on the Government that their only notion of improvement in their condition seems to be the multiplication of moderately paid offices to be given to Maltese. The Government, instead of attempting to give the people feelings of self-reliance, have intentionally kept them in a state of pupillage, have discouraged all movement, have stifled all inquiry, have perpetuated ignorance, and have even discountenanced trade as being troublesome."

Some of the worst concomitants of the system there complained of were removed at the suggestion of Sir G. C. Lewis and his senior colleague; but the system itself was allowed to grow. The Government did not extend its land and house property—indeed, it allowed it to deteriorate very considerably in comparison with that held by the Church and by private individuals; but it greatly increased the responsibilities it had assumed as the dispenser of the proceeds of that property.

Among the pious foundations which it inherited from the Knights were small endowments for the support of three hospitals and asylums. There were other bequests for providing marriage portions to young women, for distributing wheat generally among the poor, and for giving alms to the needy in particular districts.

These endowments appear to have represented about one-tenth of the revenue from lands and houses of which Sir Thomas Maitland took charge. Had the money been judiciously expended by the charity committees that he and his successors organized, it might have served for such outlay in relief of sickness and poverty as it was incumbent on the Government to incur. The committees showed no judgment, however, in spending it, and, indeed, though some faint effort was made to adhere to the special objects designated in the original bequests, they were not called upon to limit their expenditure either to those objects or to the funds thus provided for them. Being Government departments, they were able to draw upon the general treasury for what money they required, and to disburse it in any way that the Government sanctioned. They increased the number and enlarged the dimensions of the establishments under their control until, in 1836, the charges for these establishments were at least six times as great as the original endowments, absorbing nearly two-thirds of the revenue derived from Government property, and nearly a fourth of the entire revenue of the island. In spite of numerous changes and attempted reforms, almost as large a proportion of expenditure to revenue has been kept up to this day. To Mr. Rowsell's complaint, that the obnoxious wheat duty causes the chief burden of taxation to fall on the poor, it would, indeed, be a ready answer to say that the wheat duty, or some equivalent for it, would never be needed were it not for the wholesale system of so-called charity which is adopted for the supposed benefit of the poor. If the poor pay half as much again as the rich in taxes, it is because the poor have been led to expect a very large portion of the proceeds of taxation to be returned to them in the way of mischievous charity. The worst of it is that, by this arrangement, the honest and industrious poor are made to pay for the idle and thriftless.

In the absence of any sort of municipal organization, and of any private philanthropic agencies, apart from the strictly religious institutions patronised by the Church, and from the promiscuous almsgiving, which is as reckless in Malta as in other Roman Catholic countries, a good deal of State charity is, of course, inevitable. There must be a lunatic asylum, and there must be hospitals, and these establishments would be harmless if only such persons were allowed gratuitous treatment in them as could not be paid or otherwise provided for. In that case they would not be very expensive to the Government. As, moreover, there are no other poor-houses in the islands, the two *ospisii*, or asylums for the aged poor, would, within certain limits, be justifiable institutions, if they were not looked upon as little heavens below, in which old men and women may prolong their lives, when they are tired of working or begging,

or when their children are unwilling to support them. As it is, they give lamentable encouragement to improvidence. There is no dread or dislike of the ospizio in Malta, as there is of the workhouse in England. A comfortable home in it is a blessing to be looked forward to, and striven after, by every poor man and woman in the island; a prize which only a few ever really attain; but which, like other gambling speculations, tempts multitudes to try their fortune in the game of idleness and unthrift.

The system of charity that has been developed in Malta tends to make every poor person a pauper. In the way of outdoor relief not much is done, only a sum of £3,000 a year being allowed to be distributed by the charity commissioners among their pensioners, though the shortcomings of the Government in this respect are amply made up for by the thoughtless almsgiving at the church-doors and the street-corners. As if to make up for its harshness towards the poor when they are in health, the Government declares that every one who works for daily wages, as well as every beggar, has a right to receive medical assistance gratuitously when he or any member of his family is ill. Accordingly every police-station has a free dispensary attached to it, and every village is provided, at the public expense, with its "police physician," who in turn is generally a luckless hanger-on of the Government, one of the unfortunate products of the system of gratuitous half-education by which so many members of the middle class in Malta are encouraged to become useless and starving professional men, instead of honest and hard-working shopkeepers or traders.

To provide good education for the people—such as would enable them to make the best use of their chances in their own little islands, or to take due advantage of the large opportunities offered to them elsewhere as British subjects—would be of all forms of charity the most allowable; but the attempts hitherto made by the Government have not been well directed or successful. It was unfortunate that, when the Jesuits were expelled from Malta in 1768, Grand Master Lascaris should have undertaken to apply their confiscated property in founding an university. Malta is far too small to maintain for itself such an institution. Its university has all along diverted attention from humbler and more necessary educational appliances, while the few able men whom it has turned out could always have been more cheaply and more thoroughly instructed in foreign seminaries than in the native establishment. In Sir Thomas Maitland's time the revenue available for it was sufficient only to support a few pedantic chairs, though that money might have been a most valuable addition to the very scanty endowments in existence for more general education. The university has been since reorganized, and there are

now two lyceums attached to it. About eighty primary and secondary schools, also, have been established in the towns and villages, and altogether the expenditure on account of education is at least twelve times as great as it was seventy years ago. But the real work of education has yet almost to be begun.

Praiseworthy and serviceable as were nearly all the recommendations of the Commissioners of 1836, they committed a grievous mistake in proposing that Italian instead of English should be encouraged among the Maltese as a supplementary language to their vernacular. Maltese is practically an unwritten language, and therefore, however useful and expressive in common conversation, quite unsuitable as an educational medium. Italian is favoured by priests and lawyers, and in the polite society of Valetta; but the common people knew little of it forty years ago, and appear to know even less at the present time. They are aware that, except in rare cases, it can be of no use to them in business, and they cannot be expected to trouble themselves about Dante, Petrarch, and Ariosto. The plan of teaching Italian as a stepping-stone to English, which most of them are really anxious to learn, is thus only a hindrance, especially as the instruction given is of a very perfunctory sort. It is a common complaint of the Maltese who have been instructed in the Government schools, that they were there only taught to read Italian by rote, without understanding the meaning of what they read. Some changes for the better appear to have been lately made, especially since a local commission of inquiry reported in 1865 that in the few schools then existing there was very small attendance and hardly any teaching at all. But the money spent by the Government in its sham system of education seems still to be nearly all wasted. Nor have the university and the lyceums been able to do much good. They certainly train up almost gratuitously—the fees in the former being half-a-crown and in the latter a shilling a month per family—a far larger number of young men anxious for professional employment than the island can give work to. For solid and useful instruction the youth of Malta have to go to private schools, or, if they can afford it, to come to England. No one can practise as a doctor or a barrister in Malta unless he has a university degree. As these are considered to be the most gentlemanly occupations in the island, and other than Maltese degrees are within reach of only a very few, the university is fairly supplied with students whom it educates as best it can in local law and local physic. They need not learn any English or acquire any general information unless they choose. They consequently come out in great numbers every year with diplomas qualifying them to compete with one another for such paltry incomes as they can scrape up at home, but untrained for the exercise abroad of any abilities they possess. The university

has turned out a good many clever and some successful barristers and physicians, but nowhere else in the world perhaps are these professions so overcrowded with disappointed men. The Government has done what it can to make up for the mistakes it has encouraged them to fall into, by expanding its staff of professional employées to very unnecessary dimensions. But its police physicians and hospital doctors and legal auxiliaries do not find themselves passing rich on salaries ranging from £30 to £80 or £100 a year.

For another cause of failure in the education movement in Malta the Government is also to blame. The very generous interpretation it has always put upon its engagement not to interfere with the Roman Catholic religion, has all along enabled the priests to influence if not to dictate its policy, and to spoil any measure of which they do not approve. The priests in Malta are particularly averse to every kind of education outside the very narrow groove prescribed by themselves. Some of them having been carefully trained in Rome or at Stonyhurst, but the great majority being almost as illiterate as their peasant kinsmen, all alike object to any change that may weaken their hold on the people. We have played into their hands for forty years by professing to have schools in which Italian instead of English shall be the approved language, and in which even Italian has not been taught, and they owe us more thanks than they render for having elaborated a system of university instruction, which does not prevent even the best-educated men in Malta from being more devoted children of the Church than can be found in Spain or in Ireland.

In its unsatisfactory endeavours to dispense all the charity and impart all the education thought proper for the Maltese, the Government spends more than all the proceeds of the property to which the costs of its educational and charitable institutions is supposed to be chargeable; but these are only part of the duties it assumes to itself as the custodian of that property. It not only undertakes all the road-making and road-repairing required in the island, as well as the preservation of the aqueducts and tanks necessary for the supply of water to districts that would otherwise be parched up and uninhabitable, it also considers itself bound to execute all the new works and construct all the new buildings that are reasonably and unreasonably proposed for the benefit of the people. It was under the governorship of Sir Gaspard Le Marchant, who played the part of Napoleon the Little in Malta to Sir Thomas Maitland's Napoleon the Great, that Valetta and its suburbs were especially Haussmannised. Some of Sir Gaspard's undertakings were useful in themselves, and, paternal rule being as it is in Malta, they may be said to have properly devolved on the Government, though the jobbery and extravagance



connected with them are not on that account the less to be regretted. For others it is difficult to find any excuse, and least excusable of all, perhaps, was the large and handsome Opera House, which he bestowed at its own expense on the island. The Maltese are a musical people, and the military and naval officers stationed in Valetta appreciate the privilege of hearing *La Traviata* and *Il Barbiere* from two-shilling stalls. But the great majority of the natives, who cannot afford to pay even two shillings for a stall, naturally feel aggrieved that nearly half a year's revenue of their island should have been squandered in building, for the amusement of a few of their more prosperous neighbours, and of a good many English visitors, a theatre which, in order to keep down the prices, is let at a rental so low that it by no means covers the cost of the policemen and other Government-paid officials appointed to keep order during the performances. Their reasonable resentment of such unjust appropriation of their scanty resources for public works and buildings, is just now leading to somewhat unreasonable opposition to the very costly system of drainage which the Government is carrying out, and obliging them to pay for. The drainage of Valetta and its suburbs is absolutely necessary, if the island is to be saved from the imminent danger of a plague; and, in the absence of any other agency for effecting it, the Government must undertake the business. But the recklessness of some of its earlier and less justifiable exploits in the paternal management of local affairs has stirred up so much prejudice and mistrust, that the opposition papers are at present threatening it every week with something like a revolution.

In furnishing some illustrations of the plan of managing property, usurping all municipal functions, and discouraging private enterprise, which was established by Sir Thomas Maitland, I have dealt only with one part of the system of government prevailing in Malta, and with that only very incompletely. The arrangements in force for the administration of justice, and for otherwise controlling the affairs of the island, are of the same sort. Within the space at my disposal, however, it is impossible to refer to them in detail, or to attempt any general review of the working of the system as a whole. The effects of this system are painfully evident to every visitor to Malta who cares to look beneath the surface of its gay life in winter time—the gay life, that is, of the English community, and of the few well-to-do Maltese who are allowed to mix with it, in and around Valetta. Mr. Plimsoll, who spent a short time in the city last January, has published a pamphlet on *The Condition of Malta*, in which, giving a preposterously inaccurate account of the miseries of its inhabitants, he attributes them to “a system of taxation supported by the might of England, and in its

consequences characterized, so far as its Malta advocates are concerned, by more cowardly tyranny, incredible meanness, merciless cruelty, grinding oppression, and utter injustice, than disgraces even a Turkish pashalik." Such language is none the less mischievous because it is well-meant. The degradation of the great majority of the people in Malta is deplorable, but Mr. Plimsoll grossly exaggerates it. The system of taxation, moreover, has very little to do with it; nor have either the English Government or its local representatives been for some time past chargeable with any greater fault than that of failing to do all they might have done towards correcting the evil caused by the bad arrangements of their predecessors. Every one acquainted with our colonial history, indeed, must be surprised at the exceptional zeal with which—since the time, at any rate, when Lord Glenelg sent out Messrs. Austin and Lewis as the best men he could find to advise him as to the proper way of improving its condition—Malta has been cared for by the English Government. The discontent caused in the island by Sir Patrick Stuart's arbitrary rule as an imperious soldier and a bigoted Protestant, led in 1847 to the selection of a liberal Roman Catholic and a philanthropic civilian as his successor. If Mr. More O'Ferrall did not succeed in pacifying the Maltese, or insuring their prosperity, neither his own nor his employers' good nature and good sense were at fault. Sir Gaspard Le Marchant's rule between 1858 and 1864 was in many ways injurious to Malta, and his successors, Sir Henry Storks, Sir Patrick Grant, and Sir Charles Straubenzee, were not as pliant administrators as the local patriots wished for, or as able statesmen as the best interests of the island required. But, as the published dispatches of Mr. Cardwell, Lord Carnarvon, and other Secretaries of State attest, the Colonial Office did all that could be fairly expected from it to correct their blunders and supply their shortcomings, and, most recently, the honest desire of the home authorities to do justice to Malta has been shown by the appointment first of Mr. Rowsell, in 1877, to inquire into the incidence of taxation in the island, and suggest substitutes for the wheat duty; and then of Sir Penrose Julyan, in 1878, to investigate and see what reforms can be effected in all its civil establishments, except those concerned with education, the examination of which it was thought better to intrust to Mr. Keenan, on account of his special acquaintance with the subject, and his sympathy in religion with the Maltese. There has not yet been time for Sir Penrose Julyan's or Mr. Keenan's recommendations to bear fruit; but Mr. Rowsell's suggestions, as far as they are considered practicable, are now in process of being carried out.

It must not be expected, however, that all the benefits which can possibly result from these recent inquiries will quickly lead to the regeneration of Malta, or can ever suffice to repair all the harm

caused by the pernicious arrangements that were adopted when English rule was established in the island. Those arrangements, as I have endeavoured to show, were based on an entirely false theory of government. Instead of encouraging the Maltese to grow out of the childish if not slavish condition in which the Order of St. John left them, and in which, as far as it was concerned, the Church of Rome continued to hold them—instead of putting them in the way of social development and fitting them for self-government, we have strengthened and multiplied the devices for paternal rule, and, while helping them in some respects, have in others made their condition worse than it was when we took charge of them.

Malta and Gozo contain a population of about 152,000 in an area of 115 square miles, of which, however, at least one-third is altogether barren rock, while part of the rest is of very little use either for pasture or for cultivation. In Valetta and its suburbs, exclusive of the English garrison and the English visitors whom it attracts, there are about 60,000 inhabitants, who live chiefly upon the trade for which the port offers extraordinary facilities. The 90,000 or so in the country districts, being an average of about 1,400 to the habitable square mile in Malta and about 1,000 in Gozo, gain a scanty subsistence by agriculture, especially in the production of fruits and vegetables, some corn-growing and some cotton-growing, and by a few manufactures, of which perhaps maccaroni, lace, and tobacco are the most important. Mr. Rowsell estimates that three-fourths of the population of the whole colony are of the labouring class, the other fourth constituting the "upper and middle classes," though chiefly composed of small tradesmen and small farmers, "who earn, or have to spend, little more than the manual workers." He does not say in which category he ranks the swarm of priests, monks, friars, and other shaven idlers who are, in proportion, more numerous in Malta than in any other part of the world, but he adds that "between the two broad divisions has been shared equally that considerable number of persons who will not dig, but are not ashamed to beg." As matters are, many of these persons are hardly to blame for begging instead of digging. The population of Malta and Gozo is more than twice as large as the islands can support by their own resources. No doubt the great use that is made of Valetta as a halting-place for ships and cargoes, and especially in recent years as a coaling station, gives employment to large numbers. Many others are kept alive by the heavy expenditure incurred by the War Office and the Admiralty in maintaining it as a military and naval stronghold. Still there are far more people than work can be found for. The Maltese, as a rule, when not altogether cowed by poverty, or contaminated by association with the riffraff of the Mediterranean that takes

shelter among them, are a remarkably thrifty people. The better sort of them, whether working at town trades or in the fields, would put to shame many of our English labourers and artisans by their honesty and patient industry. But the redundancy of competitors in every kind of occupation brings down the wage-rate to a very low level, and leaves multitudes without any means of earning an honest livelihood at all. The average wages of farm-labourers are barely more than a 1s. a day, and those of unskilled labourers in the towns not more than 1s. 2d., while carpenters, blacksmiths, and stone-masons rarely get as much as 2s., or boat-builders, sail-makers, and tailors as much as 2s. 6d. Nor does the poverty of the lower classes enrich those above them. A few fortunate shopkeepers and merchants may succeed in making more than £400 or £500 a year, and there are five or six among them who have the reputation of being wealthy. Doctors and lawyers consider themselves prosperous if their incomes exceed £300 or £400 a year, and the revenues of some of the landed proprietors who hold local rank as marquises and counts are below those figures. All classes of society in Malta suffer from its being grievously over-populated, and, as the population has been growing at the rate of nearly 1 per cent. a year for the last thirty or forty years, this evil is constantly increasing.

The English Government is not, of course, to be blamed for not forcing Malthusian arrangements upon the people; but it is not a little at fault for encouraging, by its paternal system of administration, the rocklessness which the Church upholds as a religious duty. It is thought proper for boys and girls to marry almost as soon as they enter their teens, and it is not uncommon for them to have been the parents of a dozen children before they are thirty. It is needless to say that very few of these children live many years, and the rate of infant mortality is, I believe, higher in Malta than in any other part of the British dominions. Great numbers survive, however, to lead altogether squalid lives, and thrive, after a fashion, on ignorance and dirt. The report issued by a local commission which inquired, in 1874, into the sanitary condition of the island, reveals a most appalling state of things in the poorest quarters of Valetta and the suburbs, where overcrowding adds greatly to the miseries of poverty. These miseries are deplorable enough in the country districts, where, if there is purer air to breathe, it only quickens the appetite for food, which there are no means of satisfying. It is not strange that, among people so poor and degraded, food should be the only thing for which any appetite is shown, or that, when that is not appeased, the wretched creatures should seek relief in nothing better than the only consolations offered them by their priests. Grossly ignorant and coarsely superstitious themselves, the priests encourage superstition and ignorance among

their disciples. They cannot, and doubtless do not wish to, hinder them from trying to get work and earn a little money with which to buy a scanty portion of black bread, or a handful of locust-beans; but they do nothing to help them out of their deplorable condition. England has put a very cruel interpretation on its old promise "to secure to the Maltese in the fullest manner the free exercise of their religion," by favouring in every way a priesthood that does all it can to keep down the people, in order that they may not be intelligent enough to shake off its thralldom. Yet there has been more generosity, mistaken and baneful as it is, in that semblance of toleration, than in the other arrangements by which England has itself fostered ignorance, and stifled, happily without killing, all feelings of self-respect, all capacity for self-advancement, and everything like a healthy spirit of independence among the people. Two sentences have already been quoted from one of Sir G. C. Lewis's letters about Malta. In another, written in April, 1837, he said:—"From the narrow policy of the Government in discouraging education and discussion, there is a great want of knowledge, both of facts and principles; but there is a very fair sprinkling of intelligence, and on the whole, I should be very sanguine of the influence which might be produced upon them by a Government which looked to improving the condition of the community, and not merely to raising a revenue in order to divide it among English heads of useless departments." The scandal referred to in the last clause has long since been removed; the rest of the sentence is as true now as it was when written.

Had we left the Maltese to manage their own affairs in their own way, they might possibly, though it is hardly likely, have brought themselves to no better condition than they are in now. In that case, we should not have made ourselves responsible for their misfortunes. As it is, all our apparent concessions to their demands for self-government have been unreal. In 1835 a Council of Government was established; but as of its seven members two were chosen by the Government from the land-owning class, and one from the body of merchants, while four were paid officials, it made no pretence at being a representative body. This Council was reorganized in 1849, so as to comprise eight members elected by natives having certain property and educational qualifications, or about one-sixtieth of the population; but their votes could always be swamped by those of the official members, now raised to ten in number. Lord Cardwell, it is true, directed in 1864, when he was Colonial Secretary, "that great consideration should be shown to the opinions of the elected members of Council in matters of local and domestic interest, and that, above all, no vote of money should be passed against the majority of the elected members, except under

very special circumstances, in which the public interests or credit were seriously at stake, and never without an immediate report to the Secretary of State." That vague instruction was endorsed in 1875 by Lord Carnarvon, on the understanding that its effect was not "practically to transfer to a small number of elected members the sole responsibility of deciding important questions, not only affecting the general interests and welfare of the colony, but in many cases involving much larger interests, and thus to nullify the legitimate and beneficial influence of the official element in the Council." As those words imply, however, Malta is still, in all important respects, ruled by the Colonial Office through its representatives in Valetta. Its Council of Government is rather an organization for publishing the intentions of the authorities, and allowing complaints to be made by the unofficial members, who themselves represent only a very small fraction of the population, than a machinery for controlling by any semblance of popular opinion the management of public business. When they do not degenerate into unseemly squabbles, as is generally the case, the meetings of this select debating society are sometimes useful in disclosing abuses and ventilating grievances; but they have nothing to do with popular representative government. The representatives of the Crown are as exclusively responsible for the administration of the civil affairs of the island as for that of its military concerns. This arrangement may, under existing circumstances, be the best. To alter it suddenly, and by other than very gradual steps, would certainly cause much present inconvenience and confusion. But the fact that things are so, betrays the faultiness of the system under which, after nearly eighty years' tenure of Malta by the English, its people are still quite unable to be their own masters.

H. R. Fox BOURNE.

## THE MUSICAL CULTUS OF THE DAY.

THE charge against the English of being an unmusical nation is one of very old standing, to which the reply (almost equally old) has always been that if we have never been great producers of music, we have, at all events, shown a great appreciation of those who were. We made an Englishman of Handel, showed a most liberal hospitality to Haydn, took an early and (for the time) tolerably enlightened interest in Beethoven, and welcomed Mendelssohn with open arms. These stereotyped claims to the respect of the musical world would, however, seem very incomplete and out of date if regarded from the point of view of musical England at the present moment: or perhaps, to be strictly correct, we should rather say of musical London. For the great gulf fixed between the critical stand-point of cultivated society in London and in the provinces, which in respect of some subjects of intellectual interest may be said to have been partially bridged over of late years, seems in regard to music to be rather widened than otherwise. In most provincial concert-rooms it is probable that the *finale* of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony is still endured (when at all) with a certain bewilderment not unmixed with antagonism, and that his latest pianoforte sonatas are regarded as unintelligible and too long. In cathedral towns the *Lieder ohne Worte* are still played in the drawing-rooms, and a placid belief in Mendelssohn as the greatest composer of modern time, if not of any time, still thrives in the congenial soil of a clericalised society, impatient of new growths in art as in everything else. But in modern musical London "*τί καινόν*?" is the pass-word. Not only is there an appetite for musical performances apparently almost insatiable even by the ample supply afforded to it, but there is an absolute demand for progress, a determination, to keep up with the times, to hear the last new composer, to catch the tone of the last developments of "the higher criticism" in regard to modern music, its desires, its achievements, its possibilities. In place of being musically a rather backward society, as we once were, a society sparing in its attendance at concerts and lagging far behind Germany in our interest in new forms of composition, we are now spending a great aggregate of time in concert-rooms, music is a constant topic of conversation everywhere, and the foreign critic who were to charge us afresh with being an unmusical nation, might now be met by the retort that at least there is probably no capital where people hear so much music, and talk so much about it, as in our own.

It is always a matter of some interest to attempt to analyze a movement of this kind, and endeavour to form a just conclusion as to its real intellectual value, and the motives or impulses which give rise to it. Is the passion for music in modern English society, then, the offspring of a genuine and heartfelt interest in and an intellectual comprehension of the art; or is it, like so many other growths of social predilection, more or less a forced product of conventional life? Is it a passion, or only a fashion?

Looking at the subject in the broadest manner, as an element in the sum total of modern feeling, an increased passion for music would seem to be only one of the results of the general tendency towards a fuller emotional expression in art and literature, which is the legacy to us of the Revolution period; at least which is often so regarded. But without troubling ourselves about the origin of a wave of human feeling too vast and vague for analysis, we at all events all know and feel the distinction between George Eliot and Jane Austen, between Turner and Gainsborough, between Watts and Reynolds. The tendency of modern life has been—why we know not—towards a quickening of the emotional side of human nature, a reaction from the purely intellectual and analytical bent of the mind of the last century, an indefinable passionate longing which has been said to be summed up in the German word *Sehnsucht*, more than in any expression in our own language. And of this feeling music, in its modern forms more particularly, is the most complete and intense means of expression. It is essentially an emotional form of art—not indeed exclusively so, by any means—but more so than any other; it cannot express facts or convictions, but it gives voice to those vague and deep-seated desires and sympathies, that abstract sense of harmony and proportion in things, which are indescribable in language, which painting can only reflect from the outside, but of which modern music seems to embody (if one may use the word of what is so completely an “unbodied joy”) the inner and indefinable meaning. The relation in which music stands to many minds in the present day is that expressed in the wonderful line in Rossetti’s sonnet, *The Monochord*,—

“Oh! what is this that knows the road I came?”

an expression intelligible to all who have been able to meet the inner meaning of Beethoven in such far-reaching passages as that episode in D in the *Scherzo* of the Seventh Symphony; and perhaps to them only. At all events, to suppose that such an interest in music of a high class exists among all, or among the majority of those who discuss it and assist at its revelation, would be contrary to all experience as to the proportion of really intellectual sympathy with imaginative creations of a high class, to be found in general society. There is then an



*a priori* probability, that a considerable proportion of the professedly serious culture of music is much more superficial in its origin than its votaries would have us suppose, or than perhaps they are aware of themselves; for, after all, but a very small proportion of those who profess an enthusiasm for the highest productions of art are consciously pretenders. But a consideration of some of the circumstances which have attended the development of this professedly serious musical *cultus* in English society of late years at once tends to confirm the supposition that there is a great deal in it which is unreal and conventional.

Among these circumstances none are more significant than the remarkably rapid and consentaneous changes of taste or of musical creed which have followed each other since we began to profess to be a musical public. This peculiar phase of shifting enthusiasm commenced, in its modern form, with the *furor* excited by Mendelssohn about five-and-thirty years ago, and which continued on the increase till some time after his death. A Beethoven *furor* there never has been in this country; partly, perhaps, because he came before the time when the temper of society gave any material for one, partly because his genius stands on too lofty a pedestal for such comparatively idle worship; one might as well expect to see the works of Michel Angelo become the object of a popular mania. Rossini was the centre of a cloud of incense for a time, but in that ritual there was hardly a pretence of a serious aim; we had not then discovered the æsthetic platform. But the appearance of Mendelssohn coincided with the time when the idea that music might be more serious matter than mere pastime had dawned upon the English mind; and the comparative novelty of his style, a certain charm of sentiment, beautiful, and at the same time easy of appreciation, combined probably with the personal attraction felt towards a man peculiarly fitted to be a favourite in society, operated together to produce a paroxysm of musical enthusiasm, such as the English world had hardly known before. Mendelssohn was everything that was great in music; he united the highest qualities of Bach and Beethoven; to question the supremacy of his genius was to write yourself down an ass. No moral reprobation was too strong for those unprincipled persons who, having by course of events come into the charge of the composer's manuscripts after his decease, persisted in withholding from the world works which the too modest composer had left unpublished as unsatisfactory, but of which all the intellectual world had a right to demand the hearing. And when at last one of these works was produced at the Crystal Palace, it was an event in the musical world; no extravagance of laudation was too great to be applied by the higher criticism of the day towards a composition,<sup>1</sup> the weakness

(1) The Reformation Symphony.

of which in comparison with his other works fully explained the judgment of the composer, a much better critic of his own music than most of his public. By those who possessed a stand-point for a calmer judgment, this overacted enthusiasm must have seemed—did seem—absurd at the time; but what are we to think of it in comparison with the tone now commonly adopted in regard to Mendelssohn in professedly musical and æsthetic society? What are we to think of the claims to musical insight of a society which at the distance of these few years has contemptuously reversed its decision and overturned the pedestal of its idol? And the conclusion to which this bit of the history of English musical enthusiasm must lead, is certainly not weakened by the observation of the rapid succession of idolatries which has taken place in the interim.

Schumann was the popular successor to Mendelssohn; a composer resisted with persistent repugnance for years by English concert audiences, till suddenly, no one knew how, he became the fashion, had his day, and is now making way for Wagner. The history of the reception of Wagner by the English mind presents the same curious phenomenon of absolute and almost angry refusal of a hearing for years, followed by an outbreak of popular admiration and almost equally angry partisanship, so that to question the reality of Wagner's success, and the true philosophy of his method, is in æsthetic society to establish yourself as a weak-headed and blindly prejudiced person. The question *pro* and *con*. in regard to this composer's claim to the throne on which he has been exalted cannot be discussed here; it involves very large considerations as to the objects and conditions of musical art; the argument is still complicated by too much of prejudice on the one hand, and extravagant enthusiasm on the other, for any present chance of a judicial settlement,

“And that old common arbitrator, Time,  
Will one day end it.”

It may suffice to record here the conviction that those who imagine this last idol to be firm on his pedestal, will probably be in course of time very decidedly undeceived. But we may notice here another and remarkable instance of the fluctuation of musical taste and opinion in this country, in the unexpected and almost ardent worship of a great composer who had hitherto been merely a name (and hardly that) to English people. It is only a few years since London discovered Bach. No musician would have a word to say against the discovery in one sense, for there can hardly be a question that Bach is the fittest teacher in the whole range of the art, and that no intellect that has been applied to music ever evinced such a giant grasp of what may be called tonal construction. And if the qualities which make his greatness were really apprehended of the people, we

should have got much farther in general musical culture than there is in fact much chance of for some time to come. That they are not so apprehended is apparent, partly from the ingenuous admission of worshippers at the shrine, who not infrequently confess that they find Bach most difficult to understand; on the other hand, it must be added, one often hears him lauded for the very qualities which he has not. The position, however, of reverential acceptance of a great artist in spite of inability to understand him is in itself an admirable and a healthy one. But it seems the fate of English musical taste to run to extremes. For generations Handel has been the recognised object of musical reverence in England, his name having been often coupled, certainly, with that of his great contemporary by persons who professed a solid taste for "Handel and Bach" (a collocation of names which, considering the essential qualities of the two composers, is really about as rational as "Rossini and Schumann"), but the preference for his oratorios, as representing the highest class of music, having been for generations the palladium of British musical taste. There was much that was utterly uncritical in the British worship of Handel—a kind of John Bull spirit in music; but even more uncritical and foolish is the now obvious feeling that, Bach having been discovered, Handel is nowhere; that belief in him is an antiquated prejudice, pardonable in our days of ignorance, but utterly inexcusable in this more enlightened generation. Now there are most important qualities in which Bach deserves to be called a greater musician than Handel, though it may be doubted whether many of the people who run after Bach know what they are. At all events, they obviously do not know that Handel had most important qualities which Bach had not; that through the antiquated mannerisms and thin harmonic clothing of many even of his secondary compositions there breathes a power of dramatic expression and pathos of which no trace is to be found in the mighty but somewhat ponderous tone-architecture of the Cantor of Leipzig; that he had a mastery of the method of writing for the voice such as no purely German composer ever possessed; that his choruses exhibit a vigour, energy, and clearness of form which it needs all the constructive power and deep earnestness of Bach to surpass in effect, as he has done. All this is ignored, Handel is out of fashion, and Bach has been put on his pedestal in obedience to the last impulse of a musical public, whose judgment apparently, like Wordsworth's celebrated cloud, "moveth all together, if it move at all."

It is probable that the very facilities for hearing music of every style and class, which are now within the reach of the London public, have something to do with the promotion of this superficial formation and fluctuation of musical taste. All who wish to hear music can now hear anything, or almost anything, that they wish;

classical music is now brought to every one's door ; and the constant attendance upon musical performances gives to every one a certain knowledge of what is going on in the world of musical production, a certain opportunity of acquiring the materials for an apparently critical view of the art, so that even those who by natural temperament and taste might have remained quite indifferent on the subject, acquire so much acquaintance with it as enables them to discuss it with an apparent familiarity and knowledge, such as would formerly have been only expected from those who had the musical faculty specially developed. In short, music has become the fashion, and it is not permitted to be ignorant of it, or to have no opinion about it, on pain of being regarded as below the general level of culture ; and those who have no musical feeling or preference feel bound to "sham a little." This is not a healthy state of things, but it is perhaps a more or less inevitable condition of a transition stage from a state of ignorance or uncritical superficiality to the state of more cultured and critical knowledge, which the rising generation will, at all events, have had considerable opportunities of acquiring. For it cannot be questioned that there is an advance in the intelligent appreciation of music of the highest class in this country, difficult as it is to separate what is due to real sympathy and thoughtful culture from what is due to mere social habit and tradition. Musical instruction has in some quarters become a very different thing from the perfunctory business which it formerly was ; and for the initiation of a change for the better, in this respect, we are probably much indebted to some of the German professors of the art so specially connected with their country, who have taken up their abode among us and have inaugurated a system of instruction, which will gradually, if taken up more widely, have its results in transforming the study of music in general society from a mere show accomplishment (as it almost universally was till recently<sup>1</sup>) to the intelligent pursuit of a source of intellectual refreshing and a powerful medium of emotional expression.

The existence of a better class of musical criticism, and musical literature generally, than we at present find in this country, is much to be desired, and would no doubt have its effect in promoting a more broad and comprehensive judgment in regard to musical art than at present exists in English society. As it is, our musical literature is very defective. Musicians are seldom good writers ;

(1) A reform in musical education seems equally necessary in regard to the upper and the lower classes in England. Few of those, ladies especially, who play or sing well as amateurs, have much knowledge of the scientific basis of music, or much critical perception in regard to style and musical form ; and in regard to primary education in lower class schools, the absolute stupidity of the system by which children are taught to sing merely "by ear," that is to say by having a tune hammered into them by repetition, instead of being taught to read the language of music, cannot be too strongly condemned, and for any educational purpose is worse than useless.

and what is included under the head of musical criticism in this country must for the most part be classed under one of three heads: mere newspaper notices, in which the prejudices of the writer for or against certain artists give the only point to his writing (and this kind of thing unhappily subserves the needs of other journals than mere daily papers); extravagant effusions of the set of scribes whose business it is to recommend Wagner and the "new school;" and occasionally painstaking and honest judgments expressed in technical or conventional phraseology, and regarded (not unjustly) by the ordinary reader as simply dull. The system lately adopted of appending an analysis of the music to the programmes of classical concerts has been the occasion of the production of some very good critical writing, accompanied often by too much effusion (the besetting sin of musical writers), but it may be questioned whether these have influenced general culture much. Those who go to concerts with a head and heart capable of following and appreciating the composer's aim, do not need literary finger-posts, and those who are less enlightened are usually also less in earnest in their pursuit of the art, and do not care to take the trouble to read a book about the music at the time, or to file and study their analytical programmes afterwards.

A publication which would do something to spread, in a manner at once trustworthy and popular, the degree of knowledge of the details of the art which would enable hearers to do their own analytics, would be more to the purpose than the fugitive literature of programmes. The want of a book of this kind seems in process of being admirably supplied by the new *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*<sup>1</sup> now appearing under the editorship of Mr. George Grove, who combines with a genuine enthusiasm for his subject a faculty of accurate and laborious investigation and clear literary expression which peculiarly fit him to superintend such a publication, and render his own contributions to it of special interest and value. His article on Beethoven, though necessarily comparatively restricted, is one of the most valuable and, within its limits, complete and well-balanced specimens of musical biography that has been offered to English readers; biography combined with just so much of critical analysis as may assist the reader in forming a right estimate of the composer's place in the art, without transgressing the proper objects of a dictionary article. The amount and variety of trustworthy information upon every subject connected with music which this work promises to render accessible to the public when complete, is very remarkable, and such as no work of the kind hitherto published in England can compare with. The appearance of a

(1) *The Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Edited by George Grove, D.O.L. Vol. I. A to *Impromptu*. Macmillan & Co. 21s.

book of this kind on such a scale, and the fact that there is such a public for it as to render it worth undertaking, speak a good deal for the increased interest in music in the present day. There is only one feature in this excellent work that calls for a doubtful criticism: the presence in it of the element of musical partisanship, and of the special partialities and animosities of the group who represent the music militant of the modern school. This element is not so far very prominent; it is chiefly apparent in the contributions of one musician who, being a splendid and powerful pianoforte player, and a writer of extravagant critical effusions in very indifferent English, seems to suffer under an inverted reputation, his pianoforte playing being heard far too little and his writing seen a great deal too often. The short article on Hummel by this contributor, is simply a piece of temper directed against a composer whom he does not like, and even if a correct estimate of its subject (which may be questioned), that kind of tone is totally out of place in a dictionary. What kind of English the critics of this militant school are capable of one may realise in other articles by the same hand; how Chopin "appears to possess the secret to transmute and transfigure whatever he touches into some weird crystal, convincing in its conformation, transparent in its eccentricity" (which is certainly more than can be said of Mr. Dannreuther's own style). Berlioz, again, is "a colossus with few friends," "a marked individuality, original, puissant, bizarre, indolently one-sided," &c. This sort of thing really ought not to be allowed in a dictionary; and one is thankful to find the editor going at all events so far as to refrain from quoting some passages from this critic's essay on Beethoven in a leading magazine, because it is "not suited to the bald rigidity of a dictionary article," a somewhat mild way of characterizing what was in the main a piece of turgid extravagance.<sup>1</sup> The point is prominently mentioned here because the articles on Liszt and Wagner have not yet appeared, and if (as there is too much reason to fear) they have been confided to critics of this school, they may prove a permanent blot on the dictionary by committing it to ill-regulated enthusiasms which can only be of temporary acceptance. Of course to such an objection the stereotyped retort will be ready, that Beethoven was considered rude and inartistic in his own day, and his now accepted

(1) It was, if we remember right, in this article (*Macmillan's Magazine*, July, 1876) that a set of quotations from Beethoven's Sonatas were given in order to prove that Beethoven had anticipated and employed a certain modern trick of composition, called "metamorphosis of themes," whereby a single melodic idea is made to do duty for a whole symphony or concerto, squeezed into different shapes, or cut up into sections. It would be worth while for any one interested in vagaries of musical criticism to refer to these quotations, as an example of the kind of assertion that the apostles of the Liszt-Wagner school are capable of, in their efforts to force Beethoven into the strait-jacket of their own theories, and persuade the world that they are his legitimate successors.

works were met with hostile criticism : all which merely means that because a large number of persons cannot separate their critical view from the prejudices of their day, therefore no one can : which is a *non sequitur*. It is quite possible for people who have enough of "dry light," and are not so muddle-headed as to confound the conditions of art with those of science, and imagine that progress is a necessary condition of the former as of the latter, not only to distinguish the radical variance between Wagner's art and Beethoven's, but to recognise clearly enough the point at which Beethoven as an artist passed his zenith and lost some of his balance and completeness of style ; more than anywhere, perhaps, in that choral finale of the Ninth Symphony which has been foolishly set forth as the culmination of his genius and the point to which it had always been tending, whereas in fact it is a grand but unequal and only partially satisfactory experiment, to which the next Symphony, if he had lived to write it, would probably have borne no relation whatever. A great deal of mischief has been done by the importation of special pleading of this kind into recent musical criticism, the real object of which, as of all criticism, ought to be to obtain a clear and balanced view of the whole subject, and of which the rule (especially in a dictionary) should be emphatically, *Surtout, point de zèle*.

A difficulty, perhaps, in the way of influencing opinion by musical criticism lies in the fact that music is such a difficult thing to write about intelligibly to those who do not already know a good deal. This is the real answer to the question addressed to the present writer the other day, "Why are musical criticisms always so uninteresting ?" It is certain that they are seldom written in good literary style, and yet so absorbing and entrancing an art is music, that to the lovers of it almost any piece of criticism is more or less interesting, which gives them any new fact or suggests any new idea, in however jejune a form. On the other hand, those who have no practical acquaintance with the art are repelled and annoyed by what seems to them an unmeaning and cabalistic phraseology, a phraseology which has grown up insensibly around the art, and cannot now be dispensed with or altered, any more than the accepted form of notation, also a growth of time and circumstance. If we say of a particular composition that "in the *Allegretto* a beautiful and mysterious effect is produced by the entry in the major key of the second subject of the movement—a broad and simple melody played by the clarionets and bassoons in octaves, and supported by an undulating *arpeggio* accompaniment in triplets by the violins, while at the same time the characteristic rhythm of the first subject is restlessly kept up by the heavy pulsation of the *pizzicato* of the violoncelli and basses,"—we should be saying what to the unmusical reader

would probably be mere jargon. But the sentence, as a general description of the character and effect of the passage, would be quite intelligible to any one who knew musical phraseology, and any one well acquainted with Beethoven's symphonies will know at once what passage is described.<sup>1</sup> It is a pity that there is so much that must be called jargon connected with the art, but it must be accepted as an existing fact, and if musical and unmusical people wish to understand each other, the latter must study the language of the former. One particular usefulness of the Dictionary we have been mentioning may be in furnishing every one with a compendious and full illustration of the meanings of musical terms, as well as with concentrated and intelligible essays upon important points in the forms and the science of musical composition. It may safely be said that more will be done to promote an intelligent comprehension of music by this kind of practical information, than by big reflections upon the moral lessons of Beethoven's works, and how he delivers messages of ethical teaching and of religious love and resignation, &c., &c. All this, as far as there is any ground for such reflections, we can best feel in silence for ourselves, while from their categorical declaration in print we are disposed to shrink, responding in the spirit of Jacques's criticism of the Duke's sentimentalities—"We think of as many matters as he; but we give God thanks, and make no boast of them."

H. HEATHCOTE STATHAM.

(1) One of the most interesting and piquant pieces of contemporary musical criticism is embodied in Mr. Browning's admirable bit of grotesque, "Master Hugues of Saxo-Gotha," though many people have probably read it without the least idea that they were going through a dissertation as to the real value and meaning of the fugue form as elaborated by Bach and his school. The reader who knows the meaning will like it none the less; indeed, it may be doubted whether any non-musical reader would make out what the poet was driving at.



## LIBERAL CANDIDATES AT THE NEXT ELECTION.

It is not yet certain whether we shall have a dissolution this year or next, but in many constituencies now represented by Conservatives the Liberal managers are already looking out for candidates, and at nearly every Liberal meeting held during the last two months our policy and our chances of success at the next election have been freely discussed. Mr. Bright, in the short speech which he delivered at the close of the recent meeting in Birmingham, spoke with a force and a fire which recalled the glorious days of 1868; but the general tone of the speakers has been too timid and too apologetic to be at all satisfactory. They had very little to say, except that they wanted to turn out Lord Beaconsfield, and they did not seem very sure of being able to do it. The confession of their political Faith was very meagre, and their political Hope was "a reed shaken by the wind."

On one topic indeed some of the speakers said a great deal. In 1874 a few excellent constituencies were lost because three or four Liberals insisted on fighting for two seats. In other constituencies the party was split up into sections, alienated from each other by distrust and a disposition to avenge real or imaginary wrongs; with the army in revolt the battle was lost before it began. We have been warned, and rightly warned, against repeating this folly at the next general election. Never did so many politicians preach so many sermons on the old text—"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

All this is most admirable and edifying, or the reverse, according to the intention of the speakers. Unfortunately most of the gentlemen who have delivered these pathetic discourses on political charity appear to have meant their exhortations for those Liberals who have been trained to forbearance by a severe and protracted political discipline. It looks as if they intended all the charity to be on one side. And this interpretation of their meaning is confirmed by very much of the conversation that is said to prevail in Liberal society. The advanced men are to give way. There is an impression that they have created general distrust and alarm. The country wants to be quiet; and the men most likely to beat the Conservatives are the men who are least anxious for Liberal reforms. The rash and reckless Liberals who are already in Parliament, and whose seats are secure, must, of course, be left where they are; but the new candidates must be men who will frighten nobody, men that would never be recognised

as Liberals at all unless they were labelled. The halt and the maimed, the blind and the dumb, politicians who have been suffering for ten or a dozen years from political paralysis, are to be dragged out of the obscure asylums where they were spending their days in tranquil oblivion, and they are to be the selected heroes of the approaching contest. The more eager Liberals in the rank and file of the constituencies are required to suppress their convictions, and yet to maintain the fires of their enthusiasm.

The solitary argument by which this remarkable policy is enforced is derived from the defeat of 1874. But in telling the story of that defeat, some very important facts have been suppressed. It is true, no doubt, that a few seats were lost through local divisions for which men who claim to be advanced Liberals must be held responsible. Candidates were run who represented different sections of the party, and it was not possible for all of them to be returned. But the seats which were lost in this way do not account for the destruction of the Liberal majority. It was not the rashness of Liberal enthusiasts that ruined us, but the inaction and prostration of the very class of men who are now recommended to us as the most trustworthy representatives of the Liberal traditions of the past and the surest guarantees of future Liberal supremacy. Seats were lost because these men shrank from their duty. Nor is it any reply to say that they were alarmed by the extreme opinions of the candidates for whom they were asked to vote, and that we must take care not to alarm them again. It was not the extreme men alone who were unfortunate five years ago. We lost heavily in the counties as well as in the boroughs; and most of the candidates for the counties were men whose opinions ought not to have alarmed the most timid valetudinarians in the party.

But perhaps it may be said that the moderate men were defeated because the more advanced Liberals refused to support them, and that the exhortations to union which have been delivered lately are chiefly intended to prevent a repetition of this disloyalty. What measure of truth there may be in this statement it is not easy to determine. Some acts of the Liberal Government had unquestionably chilled the enthusiasm of the more advanced members of the party, and I think it very possible that in some constituencies, although they went to the poll for the Liberal candidates, they did not fight for them with their accustomed energy. I have no wish to underestimate the extent to which Liberal seats were lost from this cause. There are very excellent reasons why it should not be forgotten. But I believe that the party suffered still more severely from the total defection of men of another type, for whom the most moderate Liberals were not moderate enough. It is far more necessary to charge these men to

pluck up their courage than to charge advanced Liberals to exercise toleration and charity.

If we are to derive any practical guidance from the results of the last general election, there is one fact which deserves special consideration. In about thirty seats in England, Wales, and Scotland, Conservatives were displaced by Liberals; an enormous majority of these were advanced Liberals. The lesson is a very simple one; if we want to rescue a seat from a Tory, a Radical is more likely to be successful than a Whig.

Whatever may have been the causes of the disaster of 1874, and whoever may have been responsible for it, the terms on which it is now proposed to organize the party cannot be accepted. The terms are not fair. Any attempt to enforce them will provoke angry resentment, which will perpetuate and inflame the divisions they are intended to heal. The true principle on which our leaders should act is a very simple one. To every Liberal the interests of the party as a whole should be superior to the interests of any section of the party. But this is a principle which applies all round; and exhortations to mutual forbearance should be addressed to the moderate men as earnestly as to the extreme men. In constituencies where the effective Liberal strength is with the moderate Liberals, the advanced men should support the moderate candidates with their whole heart and their whole strength. In constituencies where the effective Liberal strength is with the advanced Liberals, the moderate men are bound to show the same loyalty. But if there are Liberals whose Liberalism is so tepid that they would rather let in a Tory than vote for a Radical, if there are Liberals who have a greater dread of conceding to Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Fawcett, and Mr. Chamberlain any place in the party, than of leaving the government of the country in the hands of Lord Beaconsfield, I venture to think that such men deserve no consideration in Liberal councils, and that their opinions ought to have no effect on Liberal action.

I am in a mood to listen with a dutiful and submissive spirit to speeches on political charity. If a brother Liberal has smitten me on my right cheek, I am quite willing just now to turn to him the other also. But I should like the brother who has smitten me, and who seems likely to smite me again, to listen to the same homilies; and I think that my political pastors and masters should encourage him to cultivate the same beautiful spirit that they are expecting from me. If the moderates are to be allowed to do all the smiting, and the advanced men are required to exercise all the self-restraint, it seems hardly fair. This is to cover tyranny with the name of toleration.

The policy is unsafe as well as unfair. The Liberal party, to be of any good, must consist of Liberals. It used to be supposed that the

energy and zeal of Liberal politicians were almost necessarily relaxed when they were in office, but that the keener air of the Opposition benches restored their tone. If there is any truth in this principle, the political health of very many members of the party is too prostrate to permit of any reasonable hope of restoration. The conduct of a large number of men in the House of Commons during the last three years has not been of a kind to command any confidence in a man's political tendencies, simply because he sits on the same side of the House as the Liberal leaders. The dishonour and the suffering inflicted on the country are due almost as much to the timidity, the indecision, and the total want of political earnestness, which have distinguished the Opposition, as to the blind devotion with which the Conservative members have supported their leaders. If a man's Liberalism is not hearty and fearless when the Liberals are out of office, it is likely to assume a very Conservative type when they return to power.

In making our plans for the next election, we are bound to recognise the possibility of a second defeat. Our prospects are good, if we are wisely and firmly led; but in choosing candidates we ought to consider how they will do their work if the Liberals have to remain on the Opposition benches two or three years longer. Moderates of the class that I am afraid of are troublesome enough when their friends are in office. They are a dead weight on the party, and make all progress difficult. But when their friends are in Opposition, men of this kind are more troublesome still. They are so timid, so vacillating, and so desponding, that they quench all the zeal and extinguish all the hopefulness which are necessary to make the action of their friends effective. With such men in the ranks it is impossible to fight vigorously. When the Liberal party is in power they contribute very little to its strength; when it is in Opposition they greatly increase its weakness.

● On what grounds are the constituencies to be asked to support, at the next general election, the Liberal candidates who are indisposed to commit themselves to any Liberal reforms? Are we to vote for them simply because they want to turn out the present Ministry? In the present perils which threaten the country, our first object, no doubt, should be to transfer the government to the hands of wiser and more honourable men. At the general election of 1868 the popular Liberal creed consisted of a solitary article:—I believe in Mr. Gladstone; and, for the moment, it is almost sufficient that a man should be able to say—I disbelieve in Lord Beaconsfield. But he must say it heartily. Hearty disbelief in Lord Beaconsfield means a great deal. It means very much more than is meant by some of the gentlemen who now claim to be Liberals. It

means a settled hostility against the alliance between the worst sections of the aristocracy and the selfishness, the ignorance, and the baser passions of the worst sections of the people. It means a genuine zeal for representative institutions, which the present Ministry appear to despise and to distrust, and which they have done their best to bring into contempt. It means an earnest desire for the improvement of the condition of all classes of the people. It means courageous honesty in financial policy. Some of the men who are likely to be forced on the Liberal constituencies at the next general election are incapable of these generous passions. They have listened with a lymphatic indifference and a sluggish incredulity to the speeches in which the more robust Liberals have expressed the indignation, the shame, the sorrow, and the disgust provoked by the acts of the Government. I think it will be found that most of the men who are earnest in their antagonism to Lord Beaconsfield, are men who have strong Liberal convictions. Their disbelief in the policy of the Ministry is supported and strengthened by belief in something better and nobler. Mere disbelief was never yet the foundation of a vigorous Church, nor can it ever be the foundation of a vigorous political party. Party storms will rage in the future as they have raged in the past; we must build upon the rock, or had better not build at all. When the rain descends, and the floods come, and the winds blow, the house which is built upon the sand will fall, and great will be the fall of it.

It is the duty of the Liberal leaders to look beyond the exigencies of the approaching contest. The misgovernment of the last few years will be fruitful in evil consequences for a long time to come. Even apart from that misgovernment, I think it is clear that during the next ten or fifteen years the whole condition of the country would have been subjected to a severe strain. The policy of the Ministry has accelerated and increased our troubles. The extreme commercial depression from which we are suffering may pass by, but the golden years which we remember, and which have raised the standard of comfort and luxury among all classes of the community, are not likely to return in our time. Even if our manufacturing industries recover their prosperity, the rapid development in our imports of meat from America is bringing on a crisis in the condition of the agricultural population. While the farmers could get high prices for beef and mutton they could look with equanimity upon the low price of corn; but this compensation they are rapidly losing. No moderate reduction of rents will save them from bankruptcy. Under the modern system of farming, and with the present rate of wages, which cannot be reduced without inflicting intolerable suffering and creating serious social dangers, the total annual expenditure

on a considerable farm is so enormous that a reduction of 10, 15, or 20 per cent. on what is paid to the landlord will afford the tenant no sensible relief. Farmers and landholders are threatened by a common catastrophe.

How the trouble is to be met, who can tell? For difficulties so serious heroic remedies may be necessary. Changes in the laws affecting the land are likely to be proposed of a far more sweeping character than those which have been suggested by Mr. Bright. Misery drives men mad. The stubborn resistance which has been offered to the most moderate reforms which threatened, even remotely, the social and political supremacy of the hereditary aristocracy may be terribly avenged. To avert these dangers it is necessary that the Liberal party should consist of men with a genuine devotion to the public good, men of strong intellectual and moral force, sagacious and bold, just and fearless. At such a time as this to build into the solid structure of the party mere "wood, hay, and stubble" will be to bring a lasting discredit on Liberal principles, and to inflict immeasurable evils on the nation. If a Conservative Government which has done so much harm is to be followed by a Liberal Government which can do no good, the country will be in danger of sinking into political despair; and if this happens, the wildest and most reckless adventurers will have the chance of doing infinite mischief.

And if these exceptional troubles did not menace us, there are the strongest reasons for securing an improvement in the quality of the House of Commons. Ministers would not have treated the House with such disrespect had the mass of the members on either side retained the old spirit and energy by which the privileges and powers of the House were wrested from the hands of the Crown. It looks as if there were a change in the centre of gravity of our political system. The Government is becoming too strong for Parliament. This is owing rather to the weakness of Parliament than to the strength of the Government. The Government is distinguished for its audacity but hardly for its ability. A House of Commons with a large proportion of strong men in it—strong from the strength of their political convictions, and strong in the vigour of moral earnestness—would never have tolerated the treatment to which the House has recently been subjected. To restore to the House its true weight in the conduct of our political affairs, it is urgently necessary that its benches should be filled with men who possess and deserve the confidence and respect of the country. When the country respects the House of Commons the Ministry will never dare to treat it with contempt.

My most serious complaint against the scheme which appears to be in favour among some timid Liberals is that it is likely to impair the

intellectual and moral energy of the party, and to lessen its power for rendering necessary service to the country. Able men, to whatever section of Liberalism they may belong, were never more wanted in the House of Commons than at the present moment. A real capacity for solving difficult questions of policy, and for the efficient conduct of the business of government, is always to be valued and honoured, and just now there are exceptional reasons for valuing and honouring it. A capacity for appreciating power of this kind, and the intellectual and moral qualities which make a man loyal to honest and able leaders, are also of immense worth. What I dread is the respectable mediocrity which provokes no offence, but which can command no confidence, which has no definite convictions, and can do no definite work. To send such men to the House of Commons when better men can be had is to be guilty of treason, both to the Liberal party and to the nation.

The scheme cannot work. The advanced Liberals in the provincial constituencies are capable of making great sacrifices. They are not, as a rule, wilful, wayward, or intolerant. When they are in a minority they will work hard for a moderate man, if they know that men of a more vigorous type are permitted to have a fair chance elsewhere. But if once the impression gets abroad that politicians of resolute opinions are to be everywhere avoided, and that wherever a Radical is not already in possession of a secure seat, we are to fight under a banner with all the colour washed out of it, these men will refuse to fight at all. And the result of their alienation, even in constituencies in which they form only a small minority of the Liberal strength, will be very serious, for as a rule they furnish the most energetic canvassers and the most effective popular speakers.

Where advanced Liberals form the majority of the party the attempt to conciliate and attract the timid and the hesitating by running a man whose political creed is vague and invertebrate will be fatal. Advanced Liberals show a wonderful loyalty to their local and national leaders; but the most strenuous efforts of their leaders will fail to kindle their enthusiasm for a candidate who seems to them nearer to the Conservative position than to their own. They will never support with any ardour and vehemence a man who can say nothing except that he is ready to support a vote of want of confidence in the present Government. That is excellent as far as it goes. But where the advanced Liberals are strong they will ask, What next?

The great Liberal triumphs of the past have been won by the cordial co-operation of all sections of the party. The moderate men have worked in their own way, and have done excellent service. To them have usually been conceded the positions of honour; the ex-

treme men have fought in the ranks, and are willing to fight there still. The judgment of the moderate men has always received a measure of consideration which has been at least equal to their strength at the poll; from the extreme men has come the fire, the energy, without which the most prudent counsels would never win a victory. There must be the same combination of resources at the next election if the Liberal party is to recover its supremacy. But if the candidates of advanced opinions are to be systematically discouraged, it is preposterous to expect that electors of advanced opinions will show any enthusiasm. It is not necessary to have any exceptional acquaintance with Liberal constituencies to be able to affirm with confidence that such a policy as this would be a flagrant blunder. The most elementary knowledge of human nature ought to teach our leaders that to inflict injustice on one section of their supporters just before going into the conflict is the certain way to render victory impossible. Men must be treated fairly if they are to fight well. As yet I believe that no serious mischief has been done. There is plenty of time for the responsible leaders to declare that the advanced members of the party must have fair play, and that the concessions are not to be all on one side. Any other policy will insure a defeat at the next election as disastrous as that which we sustained five years ago.

R. W. DALE.



## PARIS UNDER THE MONARCHY OF THE RESTORATION.

THE revolutions of France are always made profoundly interesting by the character and the aims of her people. No people have more brilliant mental gifts. No people, perhaps, have had such high political and social aspirations. The French have rebelled against such restraints of privilege or power as more phlegmatic races would have borne with well-drilled meekness. They have also committed mistakes and fallen into calamities, which have made them a by-word among nations that the future will be less careful to remember. It is this union of splendid mental qualities with high ideals and with mighty failures that gives so peculiar a charm to their grand history. France has for ninety years been the chief trial-ground of social and political experiments. She tells us what to avoid and also what to expect. And just as some highly strung but badly balanced minds are often the first to catch the ideas of the future, so, perhaps, are the troubles of France and the gathering consistency of her institutions the magic mirror which reflects the Europe of our children's children.

One of the most interesting experiments in all the history of France was the attempt to revive a Legitimate Monarchy amid the ruins left by the Revolution. The most brilliant nobility and the most powerful Church in Europe had been effaced. The most aristocratic of societies had been pulverized into untitled units by the tremendous roller of the Republic. And the Republic itself was gone; the Consulate was gone; the Empire was gone. The revolutionary names had become but memories; and a lonely rock in the Atlantic was about to be the prison, and was soon to be the grave, of the great man whose selfishness, and disdain for suffering, and passion for glory, were scarcely less wonderful than his mighty genius. But amid all this ruin the Revolution had left a form of society, bound together by instincts of equality, and planted on something like equality of inheritance. The Revolution had placed, not, indeed, the government, but, what is incomparably more important, the social constitution, on foundations of adamant, and had given France a greater promise of stability in the future than any other country of Western Europe.

Such was the France which the Bourbons saw when they came back from their long exile in 1814, and a second time in 1815. It has been said that they were exactly the same when they returned as they had been when they went away, having "learned nothing

and forgotten nothing" from the terrible calamities which had been largely brought about by their own folly. But that taunt is not quite true, so far at least as regards the new king, Louis XVIII. No one knew better how hopeless or how fatal would be any attempt to turn back the democratic stream and build anew the whole of the ancient society. He was the cleverest and most cultivated man of his family. He used to study and write in the old days of Louis XV. when he was the Comte de Provence, when the most potent personage at the court was Madame Dubarry, and when none but philosophic dreamers feared a revolution. "You must put that question to the Comte de Provence," his brother, the Duc de Berri, would say when he was asked about something within the compass of printed books. The Comte de Provence read much, and wrote pretty well for a prince. He wrote squibs against Turgot. He wrote plays at the old court; during his exile and after the Restoration he wrote an astonishing number of neatly expressed letters. He was the polite letter-writer in person. And he was also as free from what some people called superstition and others belief as many an abbé of the old French Church. It was whispered that he was a Voltairean, and his favourite author was well known to be Horace. A cultivated man of the world, a cynic, and a cold voluptuary, he was a king in whom it is difficult even for the spirit of loyalty itself to find a hero. But he had a hard, clear brain; he really saw some of the deeper meanings of the Revolution; and he was in no mood for tilting against the windmills of democracy, like his Quixotic brother and successor, the Comte d'Artois. So he gave his subjects the assurance of many liberties in the form of a charter or constitution.

At the same time no Bourbon was ever prouder of his lineage, or more tenacious of all the forms which expressed the majesty of the French throne. He never allowed even the obscurity and the privations of exile to lower the dignity of the phrases which befitted the head of the greatest family in Europe. When the Doge of Venice, at the bidding of Napoleon, had invited him to quit Verona in the darkest days of his fortunes, he proudly answered that he would leave the town, but that six names of his family must be erased from the golden book of the Venetian nobility, and he demanded the return of the sword which his ancestor, Henry IV., had presented to the Venetian Republic. When Napoleon promised to give him great territorial estates if he would surrender his claims to the French throne, he answered that, as the successor of Francis I., he wished, at least, to keep the power of saying, "*Nous avons tout perdu, fors l'honneur.*"

Such a prince was true to the character of a lifetime when, on coming to the Tuileries, he restored much of the stately pomp which

had made Versailles the most brilliant court in Europe. Some of the greatest nobles in France actively performed such duties as seem to have a menial air when unsanctified by courts. The master of the household was the Duc d'Escars, whom the King called his *grand maître de la cuisine*. That great noble, it is said, had profoundly studied the art of cookery, was proud of the original genius with which he could minister to the subtleties of taste, and gave, it has been said, as much thought to the plan of a dinner as a great general would give to the plan of a campaign.<sup>1</sup> Another noble, M. de Cossé Brissac, had the direction of the *paneterie*. A third, the Comte de Rothe, was the King's chief cup-bearer. A fourth, the Marquis de Montdragon, had the honour of asking his Majesty what he would have for dinner. And the Grand Chamberlain of the King, the great noble who stood behind his chair at dinner, and who had the privilege of aiding him in the sacred mysteries of his toilette, was the ex-bishop, ex-revolutionist, ex-confiscator of the Church lands, ex-servant of the Directory, ex-spy, ex-Foreign Minister of Napoleon, ex-betrayer of Napoleon, ex-ambassador at Vienna, ex-Foreign Minister of Louis XVIII. himself, ex-everything; the coldest heart and keenest tongue in Europe; the arch intriguer who had deserted every master that he had served, and who had still to desert another; whose vulpine sagacity took him more swiftly than an intellect like Bonaparte's to the place where booty lay; whose life was one long incarnate refutation of the maxim that *honesty is the best policy*; the consummate diplomatist who had enriched himself with the pillage of commissions on the diplomatic work which he had done for his imperial master, and whose career was furrowed with lies; but who always told his falsehoods, and stole, and gave his benefactors up to the police, and got to the right side of the hedge, with the consummate grace and good-breeding of a *grand seigneur* of old France. No man ever lifted his hat so gracefully to the devil as M. de Talleyrand. He kept his place at the Tuileries chiefly for a reason which he himself expressed, when Louis XVIII. flattered him by asking how he had managed to trip up both the Directory and Napoleon. "Mon Dieu, Sire," he modestly replied, "je n'ai rien fait pour cela. C'est quelque chose d'inexplicable que j'ai en moi, et qui porte malheur aux gouvernements qui me négligent." Accordingly the Bourbons did not neglect Talleyrand. But even he might have found his tenure of courtly office less secure if his skill in the courtier's art had not been equal to his disdain for the moral law. For at the Tuileries reigned much of that matchless ease, and dignity, and grace of manner which had been the chief distinction of Versailles. The court of the restored Bourbons was incomparably the finest school of ceremonial politeness in Europe. Perhaps our

(1) *Histoire de la Restauration. Par un Homme d'Etat. P. 233.*

own may have been slightly like it in the days of the Stuarts. The courtiers had much of that composed serenity which enabled Talleyrand to bear in silence a shower of Napoleon's ferocious taunts, and then say to a companion as he limped down-stairs, "What a pity it is that so great a man should be so badly bred."

The King and the princes of the blood showed for the monarchy and all its hierarchies a degree of devout respect such as humbler folk keep for the sanctities of religion. Louis XVIII. went through the ceremonies of the Tuileries, and uttered regal words of greeting to his courtiers, and presided at the council table, even when so paralysed by disease that he had to be wheeled about in a chair, and when his limbs were already stiffening into death. "A King of France dies, but he is never ill," was his reply to the entreaties of ministering affection a few days before the close. And the majesty of the courtly etiquette would not unbend even in the presence of death itself. One night the end came to the proud spirit of the old King; the public gardens of the Tuileries were filled with people watching for the token that he had passed away; couriers were ready to speed through France with the message that the people had a new master; the heralds were waiting in the ante-chambers for the summons to proclaim, "*Le Roi est mort ! vive le Roi !*"; the courtiers were preparing to bend before their new sovereign; and, amid all these accompaniments of natural suspense, the King's brother and heir, the Comte d'Artois, his nephew, and his niece, the Duc and the Duchesse d'Angoulême, knelt beside the bed of the dying monarch. After he had passed away, the new King, the new Dauphin, and the new Dauphiness, rose to quit the room; and, as they were about to leave it, what was the first impulse of the religious, austere, sorrowful Duchesse d'Angoulême? It was a grand tribute to etiquette. Hitherto, as the daughter of Louis XVI., she had possessed the right of preceding her husband, who had only been the nephew of a king; but that right ceased from the moment at which his father inherited the throne; and, as the tearful group of mourners were about to go out of the room in which Louis lay dead, the Duchess was the first to signify the change in her rank with the words, "*Passez, monsieur le Dauphin.*"

But the French court of the Restoration had to think of more serious things than deportment and the plenary inspiration of court circulars; and, in truth, the social side of the Tuileries was of small account compared with the poetical. While Louis XVIII. was as nearly a Liberal as providential arrangements would allow a crowned Bourbon of the elder branch to be, his brother, the Comte d'Artois, had all the grand pretensions of the old court, which assumed that the rule of the Bourbons was cunningly interwoven with the final arrangements of the universe, and that a main purpose of the Chris-

tian revelation was to provide the kings of France with an apostolical succession of private chaplains. Of the Comte d'Artois it was really true that he had learned nothing and forgotten nothing from the calamities of exile. His stormy and pleasure-loving youth at Versailles had left him neither time nor taste for the studies and the society which had softened the inherited ideas of his elder brother, and made many of the young nobles disciples of Voltaire. He had hated the Revolution from the outset. He would never have given way one inch to Mirabeau and the other revolutionists who had come to Versailles, with insolent demands that the pinched common people should have some power of saying how far they might be fleeced for the benefit of the courtiers. He fancied that his brother, Louis XVI., might have died quietly in bed, and that there would have been no Revolution, and no Napoleon, and no upheaval of European society, if Mirabeau and other troublesome talkers had been locked up. A German is said to have reasoned in the same fashion about the source of the water in the Danube. That great river is said to rise in the pleasure grounds of a gentleman in the Black Forest. On seeing the little bubbling spring the countryman clapped his hat upon it, held back the water for a minute or two, and exclaimed, "Won't the people of Vienna be astonished at the stoppage of the Danube!" A great many political reasoners are like that profound rustic, and the Comte d'Artois was one of them. Hence, when the Bastille fell, and the court bowed before the democratic storm, he saw that France was no place for him, and he secretly quitted Versailles with his two sons, the Duc d'Angoulême and the Duc de Berri. Exile, the beheading of the King and the Queen, the Reign of Terror, and the Empire, only deepened his hatred of all that was meant by the symbol of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. Religious feelings gave in time a touch of spiritual fervour to his Bourbonic creed. A strange story is told to mark the turning-point of his life. His friend, Madame de Polastron, when on a penitent death-bed, is said to have made him take the communion along with her, share with her one consecrated wafer, and vow, amid all the solemnity of the viaticum, that he would henceforth be true to her memory and live in the sight of the Church. He is believed to have kept his word. At all events, he felt bound by all the sanctities of religion to put down the revolutionary spirit, which had made the France of Saint Louis set up the Goddess of Reason. But outwardly he was, when he returned to Paris, the same charming, gracious, lively being as he had been in the court of Marie Antoinette. He had the same vanity and love of applause; the same passion for the chase; the same fervent belief in the magical power of good breeding. He meant to conquer the people by his smiles and gestures and light words of courtesy. Sometimes he was compared to our own Prince Regent.

As Thackeray has said, it was a matter of dispute which of the two princes was the first gentleman in Europe. Even the most patriotic loyalty must admit, however, that our own gracious prince would have stood the comparison better, if he had paid some slight heed to the imperative part of the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and possessed a trifling pinch of the virtues which could have been found among the least of his own lackeys. The Comte d'Artois at all events was a model of gracious courtesy, and when he entered Paris amid a crowd of the Royalists who had been waiting for the return of their old princes, he seemed to smile forgiveness even upon the agents of Revolution. "Plus de divisions: la paix et la France; je la revois enfin, et rien n'y est changé," he is said to have said, "si ce n'est qu'il s'y trouve un Français de plus." He never did utter these words; they were made up for him in the house of M. de Talleyrand, by M. Beugnot, a well-known Frenchman, who was set by the arch-master of deception to give a glowing account of the royal entry, and put into the Prince's mouth some such *mot* as all Frenchmen could quote. "That is what Monsieur said," exclaimed Talleyrand, as soon as the words were read to him; "I will answer for him." So the phrase was put into the *Moniteur*. The French were delighted by the charming verbal grace of the heir to the crown; the Prince himself never denied that he had spoken with a royal command of his native language, and I dare say that in time he as firmly fancied himself to be the author of Beugnot's *mot* as our own Prince Regent believed, in certain stages of convivial faith, that he had been at the battle of Waterloo. Nay, it is said that M. Beugnot, again at the prompting of Talleyrand, coined the almost equally famous boast with which Louis XVIII. is said to have met the threat of the Prussians to blow up the bridge of Jena. The King was said to have declared that they would have to blow him into the air with it, for he would take his seat upon the emblem of the great French victory. That vaunt, it is stated, was composed for him, or at least put into the concise form which would please the most literary nation in the world.

But the court soon found sterner work to do than dispensing smiles and accepting the paternity of foundling *mots*. The Comte d'Artois was sure that his brother was going the way of Louis XVI. by dabbling in constitutions. He had a true Bourbon contempt for that Ministerial responsibility of which we in this country are so proud. He would govern as well as reign. He would command, and his Ministers should obey. "I would rather saw wood," he said, "than be a king on the same conditions as the King of England."

At first the Comte d'Artois would not take that oath of constitutional fidelity which was exacted from all the Peers and the Deputies. Even his final consent was only of that reluctant kind

which leaves a keen scent for the possibilities of evasion. Round him gathered a group of persons as convinced as himself that the only way to keep down the spirit of Revolution was to revive the kingly temper which had enabled Louis XIV. to meet the Parliament of Paris with a riding switch in his hand. Among others was a Princess who is, perhaps, the most pathetic figure among all the courts of this century. Daughter of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, the Duchesse d'Angoulême had been imprisoned with her parents in the Temple. Her father and mother and aunt had perished under the guillotine. Her brother, the Dauphin, had died of cruel treatment in the revolutionary prison. Already her cup of sorrow was so full that she had been called the Antigone of France. Grief had hardened her political ideas into austerity, and her strength of spirit would have made her a formidable power if her cousin and husband, the new Dauphin, had ever reached the throne. Napoleon said that she was the only man of her family. Pity for her immense misfortunes and her really noble character was mingled with irritation at the stinging words which she threw at all who declined to be abjectly submissive to the throne and the Church. She was so sincere that, although a Bourbon, she often forgot to be polite. One day she was at the Tuileries when Charles X. was receiving the chief dignitaries of France, and among others the judges of the highest Court of Appeal in Paris. Those magistrates had deeply offended the King and his friends by giving a decision which asserted the freedom of the Press at a time when the court had tried to crush liberty of speech. When they came to make their bow to the Duchesse d'Angoulême, she made a quick gesture with her fan, and angrily said, "Passez !" The memory of such words lived longer than that of real injuries.

Round the Duchess and her father-in-law, the Comte d'Artois, gathered many congenial spirits in that part of the Tuileries which was called the Pavillon Marsan. There was to be found a rival court to that of the King. It was a court composed in part of nobles who had once listened to the promptings of a passion for reform or change. Some of them may have spoken lightly of the clergy amid the fatal irreverence which, they thought, had ruined the monarchy. Some of them may have enjoyed the scoffing epigrams of Voltaire. Some may have rubbed shoulders with courtiers who had gone to those select little atheistical supper parties, in one of which our own countryman, David Hume, found himself the most orthodox man in the room. But in exile all of them had learned to believe that the Church had been the very keystone of the social fabric which had borne the court and the aristocracy. It was the revolt against religious tradition, they were convinced, that had made peasant and artisan pull down the great hierarchy of social ranks which had been

bound together by inherited beliefs, affection, and loyalty—in one word, by the mysterious cement of tradition. It was criticism divorced from the guidance of the Church, it was arrogant philosophy, it was impiety that had turned the French people against the rulers and the social superiors who had been set over them by heaven. Thus many of the *Emigrés*, as they were called, came to see in all forms of liberty so many kinds of revolt against divine order. Their hatred of Voltaireanism and of Liberalism gathered a religious intensity as they lived, poor and neglected, in the back streets of London, and it might be said that their mourning for the old lost gaiety of Versailles had something of Hebrew bitterness. A poet might say that they tuned their harps sadly to the strains of the Church, and that by the waters of our own Babylon they sat down and wept as they remembered the Zion of the Seine.

Men and women who came back in that temper were not inclined to tolerate either the manners or the claims of the masters who had grown up in France during their absence. So aristocratic a court as that of the Tuileries naturally disdained the plebeian nobles, whom Napoleon had lifted to the highest ranks of his brand-new peerage for their prowess on the battle-field. The smallest sprig of ancient nobility affected to look down on the rough soldiers whose fame had been carried to the ends of the earth by the victories of the Grand Army. In one case there is reason to believe that disdain did much to shape a great and memorable tragedy. When the Emperor was banished to Elba, the most brilliant, if not the ablest, of all his commanders, Marshal Ney, naturally put his sword at the service of a court which had become the governing symbol of the nation. When the Emperor broke away from Elba, Ney boasted to the King that he would bring Bonaparte back to Paris in a cage. But on leaving the capital to take the command of the army, the Marshal poured out a torrent of reproaches against the Bourbons. "I will not be humiliated," he exclaimed to one of his old comrades. He bitterly complained that his wife came home to him with tears in her eyes, on account of the indignities to which she was subjected in the Tuileries; and he did not choose that the wife of Michael Ney, Marshal of France, Duc d'Elchingen, Prince de la Moskowa, the victor of Ulm and Friedland, the hero of the retreat from Moscow, "the bravest of the brave," should be insulted by the wives of nobles who were personally unfit to command a corporal's guard, and who owed their social position to an accident. He also complained that the King meant to set aside the generals of the Empire. "It is only with Bonaparte," he added, "that we can have consideration." Thus was Ney induced to betray his trust by going over to the side of Napoleon. The result was those Hundred Days of Imperial power, which were cut short by the battle of Waterloo and the



banishment of Napoleon to St. Helena. That Ney had committed a crime is indisputable; but excuses might be found in the conflict of authority in France; and at all events his comrades, as well as himself, believed that he was entitled to the benefit of an amnesty by the conditions on which Paris was surrendered to the allied armies. Even if he had not been sheltered, the King and the courtiers might have been expected to remember that Ney was among the greatest of Frenchmen, and that clemency peculiarly became Bourbons who had encouraged the enemies of their own country. But the courtiers said that Ney should die; the ladies of the palace were even more bitter than their husbands; the Duchesse d'Angoulême, sad to say, vehemently insisted that the Marshal should be shot; Madame Ney passionately appealed to the Duke of Wellington, who only referred her to the King, and the King would speak no word of mercy. So Michael Ney died one morning under the balls of a firing party in the gardens of the Luxembourg. He died as became "the bravest of the brave." And it would have been better for the Bourbons to have lost a great battle, than to have left such a memory of their inability to forgive a great foe.

The King equally refused to pardon another of the soldiers who had helped Napoleon, Colonel Labédoyère, in spite of the frantic entreaties of his wife. A civilian who had been convicted of the same crime, M. de Lavalette, was saved from death only by the romantic heroism of Madame de Lavalette, who went to his cell, changed clothes with him, and thus enabled him to escape. Long lists of generals and officials would have died if the King and his ministers had not at last resolutely set themselves against the avenging spirit of the courtiers. The most reckless of all judges and politicians are not ambitious kings, or even vapouring ministers, but the idlers of courts, the loafers in clubs, and the wealthy horse jockeys, who shout appeals for the excitement of vengeance or war from the back benches to which they are banished by their own intellectual feebleness. The French Ministers could show clemency at Paris, but they were not so well able to keep down the fury of the Royalists in the provinces. Thus was the Red terror succeeded by the White. It is a sickening story of assassination and massacre. Violence, unhappily, is not confined to any one faction; reaction may leave as dark traces as revolution; and neither a courtly manner nor loyalty to kings is proof against the plebeian impulses of passion.

Among the party which gathered round the Comte d'Artois, and which thought that it was the last hope of the monarchy, the temper of intolerance was curiously stimulated by the spirit of theology. When the *Emigrés* returned to France they found that the religious character of their political creed was already embodied in an

organization which was to grow until it should almost overshadow the State itself. That was the famous Congregation. Many of us when we read the Republican journals of France may wonder at the space which they give to the denunciation of the clerical party or the Jesuits. In this country we are inclined to doubt the political sagacity of any member of Parliament who rises in his place to blame the Jesuits for anything that may happen to have gone wrong in Church or State. We have come to admit, in fact, that Jesuits are pretty much like other people, and even to suspect that Pascal did them some injustice in his *Lettres écrites à un Provincial*. We cannot understand, therefore, why one French statesman says, "Le cléricisme, c'est l'ennemi;" why Prince Napoleon exclaimed, "Semez le Jésuite, et moissonnez la révolte;" or why so able a newspaper as *La République Française*, lately the organ of M. Gambetta, should spend columns in the denunciation of the political power of the French priests, who, in all the private relations of life, are really very good sort of people. We cannot understand these things, nor can we trace the causes which ruined the monarchy of the Restoration, unless we cast a glance at that mysterious, renowned, and hated Congregation which the *Emigrés* found budding into power when they returned to France.

When that country was blockaded during the wars of Napoleon the Société de Missions Étrangères found itself nearly cut off from its old ground of work in pagan countries. So it turned its attention to the paganism of France. Soon there gathered round it many of those Royalist nobles who sincerely believed that the restoration of religion must go hand in hand with the restoration of monarchy. Placed under the authority of a Jesuit, the society was speedily organized with all the skill which never fails his great order. It had secret relations with all the departments of the State even in the time of the Empire; and it was enabled to become a great political as well as a religious power by the return of the King. Its aims were to overcome the still powerful Voltaireanism, to make the French people loyal to the Crown, and to give to devotion to the Bourbons a religious fervour. In order to escape criticism it was organized as a secret society. A distinguished ecclesiastic was at the head of the order, and round him were gathered a group of trusted priests and laymen. That inner circle was scarcely ever reached except by men of the highest social station and unimpeachable devotion to the Church. Next came a much larger group of devotees who were going through the duties of a novitiate. These two groups were really the Congregation, and they secretly met in the Rue du Bac for religious worship and consultation on the political prosperity of the Church. In a looser way were affiliated a crowd of the men who held the highest posts in the court, the army, and the public service.

Gradually, indeed, the Congregation included all the men who were at once intensely Catholic and intensely Legitimist. It is said to have included three members of the royal family, one prince outside that circle, two dukes, fifteen marquises, thirty-four counts, eight viscounts, twenty-one barons, and thirty-five chevaliers, besides a crowd of generals, judges, barristers, and deputies. All these dignitaries worked with a skill which casts into the shade even the genius of the Birmingham four hundred. They formed literary societies for the spreading of healthy doctrines; others for the delivery of lectures to the working people; and others, under the patronage of Saint Joseph, to help the industrial poor. Thus were loyalty to the Pope and the King, the cause of religion and of the Bourbons, divine duty and divine right, spread abroad in fly-sheets, insinuated in popular discourses, broadly taught in the pulpit, and doled out by charity organization committees. The Congregation had its own wine shops, the keepers of which had to see that their clients were loyal and religious as well as thirsty. The Congregation gave certificates of character to domestic servants, and thus turned itself into a register office for the propagation of the faith. The Congregation had enabled the Jesuits to come back to France under the shadow of courtly favour, although their presence was forbidden by law, and, under fanciful titles, they planted colleges to which all the great Catholic families sent their sons. The Congregation laid its hand on a vast number of the elementary schools by founding a half-clerical and celibate brotherhood of teachers, who are to this day the propagandists of Catholic doctrine in the class-rooms of the poor, and whom the Republican party is eager to drive from the communal schools. Perhaps the Congregation crowned its work by buying Mont Valérien. At that time Mont Valérien was merely a rounded eminence, and not, as it is now, a great fortress frowning in grim strength over the exquisite valley and beautiful windings of the Seine. A retreat was built on the top of that hill, and it took the form of a remarkably comfortable and decidedly expensive hotel, with a good billiard-room and a first-rate cellar. Thither rich penitents might go to profit by the counsel of the Jesuit fathers. If they sought to give special proofs of devotion to the Queen of Heaven, and therefore to the King of France, the strength of their obedience was tried by menial offices, and, when found sufficiently submissive, they reached that renowned company of devout and well-born Legitimists who were called *Jésuites à robe courte*.

But the chiefs of the Congregation were too shrewd to fancy that they could bring back the Catholicism and the loyalty of France by the hidden dictates of religious Carbonari. They knew that their sails must be filled by the wind of popular enthusiasm, and they systematically tried for years to preach the people

into a great religious revival. Bands of eloquent priests went from town to town, and their coming was signalised by prodigious advertising. Known to be the favourites of the court, they were often escorted into a town by the prefect, the magistrates, the municipal officers, and the garrison of the place. The streets were lined with enthusiastic Royalists who had been obliged to hide their loyalty in the dark days of the Empire and the Republic. White-robed priests and maidens wound through the streets in long processions singing penitential psalms, and with them went men bearing huge wooden crosses, until they came to the spot in which the Revolution had planted one of its trees of liberty, and then—that symbol of destructive equality having been uprooted—the missionaries planted the symbol of salvation. In this case, unhappily, it was also a symbol of vengeance. The preachers lashed the hearers into a frenzy by sermons against the wickedness of the Revolution; the pathos of the Christian religion was made to find a centre in the prison of the Temple, its maledictions in the Convention; and the twin poles of piety and infamy were found in Louis XVI. and Robespierre. Towns often wore an ascetic air during the visits of the missionaries, and all the theatres were shut by order of the municipal authorities. A pulpit war was waged against books as well as principles and memories, for processions were formed to fling the works of Voltaire and Rousseau into a loyal bonfire in the chief square of the town. Nor did the missionaries disdain to go for the stimulus of religious loyalty to the opera and the vaudeville, for, as some other revivalists have done, they often set hymns to lively secular airs, and sometimes they parodied in words of Catholic loyalty the songs of the Revolution. But there was one revolutionary song which they did not parody, and that was the song which had rung through Europe like the blast of a trumpet, carrying a sentence of doom to the enemies of liberty. It would not have been easy to attune the feeble words of sacerdotal loyalty to the fierce chant of the Marseillaise, nor well to awaken by its terrible music a host of accusing memories.

Such was the machinery of the mysterious society which had borrowed the devices of the Carbonari for the sake of the monarchy and the Church. It was very powerful, even though some of its devotees coolly denied that it had any existence. After a time the Congregation became supreme at the court; it guided the Ministry; it directed what professors should be appointed by the Ministry; it made war upon the disloyal influence of science; it dictated to the magistracy; it laid its hand upon the army; it controlled the education of the young; and it had the honour of conducting the dynasty by the shortest way to ruin.

As a compact body the Congregation ceased to exist long ago, but

the memory of its power envenoms the political contests of France to this hour, and helps to explain the popular hatred which defeated the Duc de Broglie's attempt to substitute himself and his clerical friends for the Republican constitution. The Liberals naturally declared that the members of the Congregation were hypocrites. There were doubtless many hypocrites among them. It is not necessary to believe that all the Puritans were saints because they quoted the Book of Kings in the heat of fight, and wrestled in prayer when about to make a motion in Committee of the whole House. It is equally unnecessary to assume the absolute sincerity of judges who went regularly to mass when they found that the shortest cut to the higher courts lay through the sacristy, or the perfect sainthood of blaspheming old generals of the Empire, who suddenly began to flaunt their prayer-books when they wanted to get the command of a *corps d'armée*. While Talleyrand was seen walking in a religious procession, it was impossible to forget the memorable occasion when, as Bishop of Autun, he had said mass at the fête of the Federation on the Champ de Mars in much the same leering fashion as Mephistopheles might have said it before Faust and Marguerite. But hypocrisy will account only for a small part of the power wielded by the Congregation. Hypocrisy will explain very little in the life of nations. Tartuffe has but a small diocese. Most members of the Congregation were undoubtedly sincere, and we cannot wonder that, believing what they did, they should have striven to plant the Church and the throne on the rock of absolute obedience to visible authority. But sincerity cannot overcome the infirmities of human nature, and when religion tries to put down impiety by political power, or when political power tries to keep up thrones and Ministries by the help of bishops, the State is apt to become unctuous, the Church to become grimy, and both to become so unscrupulous as to shock worldlings. Nor can sincerity defeat those general tendencies which are to the moral world what the law of gravitation is to the physical. The Congregation could no more turn back that stream of general tendency which broke into foam in the Revolution, than the Society of Jesus could stem that kindred torrent which was signalized by the destructive force of the Reformation.

The missionaries were not France, nor was the Congregation, nor was the court, nor was the King. There was another and greater, and more intelligent France, which gloried in the Revolution, ridiculed divine right, detested the clerical party, and supported the monarchy only because it was constitutional. A distinguished visitor to the Tuileries could readily reach the centre of that other France, for he had only to cross the street and enter the Palais Royal. There he would have found another court, and the head of it was another Bourbon. If a Liberal, and especially if an intelligent Liberal, the visitor would have been cordially welcomed by a

prince who had once been called the Duc de Valois, who at this time was styled the Duc d'Orleans, and who lives in history as King Louis Philippe. Descended from a younger son of Louis XIII., and also by the female side from a legitimised son of Louis XIV., he had a large share of Bourbon blood, and at least one of his sons, who is still alive—the Duc de Nemours—is a walking image of his great ancestor, Henry of Navarre. The son of that Duc d'Orleans who was called Egalité, who voted for the death of his kinsman, Louis XVI., and yet who perished on the revolutionary scaffold, Louis Philippe had been taught in early youth the philosophic precepts of the eighteenth century, had been among the first to welcome the glories of the Revolution, had attended the meetings of the Jacobin Club, and fought gallantly in the armies of liberty against the coalition of the kings. But the Reign of Terror frightened him away from the field of the Republic, and, flying from its vengeance, he had led for years a life of privation and adventure. He had taught mathematics under an assumed name in a Swiss boarding-school, he had visited America, wandered about Europe, and lived quietly at Twickenham, before the fall of the Empire had allowed him to return to France. He had made his peace with the elder Bourbons, in much the same way as some of his sons and his grandsons went a few years ago to Frohsdorf to pay homage to the Comte de Chambord. But Louis XVIII. never believed the conversion to be complete, and he signified his distrust both by denying his cousin the title of Royal Highness, and giving him merely the usufruct of the vast estates which had belonged to his family. The more generous Charles X. did, however, grant the coveted title, and the still more coveted fee-simple of the paternal possessions.

Fondness for money was the chief blot on Louis Philippe's character, and it made him the theme of a thousand satires. After he had become King of the French it once made him the subject of grave calumnies, when the poor old Duc de Bourbon, the last of the Princes of Condé, was found hanging dead from the window cord of his bedroom; when suspicion fell upon a too well-known Englishwoman, the Duc de Bourbon's companion, Madame de Feuchères; and when it was found that by her persecutions he had been induced to leave part of his vast wealth to her, and by far the largest share of it to Louis Philippe's fourth son, the present Duc d'Aumale. But if Louis Philippe liked money better than became a prince, he also showed an unprincely and admirable respect for those homely virtues which are more important than thrones. He set a good example to the whole of France as a husband and a father. And his very faults had their political uses, for although his loyalty could be sycophantic at court, he happily found it easy to display a robust ingratitude at the call of political duty. As his personal interests were in the same line as those of France, he was fortunately able to show that, by forgetting

the kindness of the King and listening to the voice of sheer selfishness, he could display the highest patriotism. A very clever, well-read, travelled man, a student of political history, sceptical rather than devout, fond of intellectual society, and skilled in discussion, he had naturally a contempt for the bigotry, the ignorance, and the political blindness of the court. Bluff and hearty, and yet wheedling in manner, he had always the air of a person who wants to sell something. He looked, in fact, like a princely, but advertising, commission agent, eager to dispose of a large stock of national happiness, and not unwilling to accept the usual percentage on the sale. He had admirable sons to offer to such great princesses as were in need of husbands. He was mortified because one of them, the Duc de Nemours, did not get a chance of marrying our own Queen; and he fancied that he had put another of them, the Duc de Montpensier, on the steps of the Spanish throne by that grimiest of all diplomatic intrigues which goes by the name of the Spanish Marriages. Nor did he forget that his father, and even he himself, had once been democratic chiefs; for he sent his sons to the public schools of Paris, and even after he had become the ruler of France, he was so ostentatiously a citizen king as to be fond of shaking hands with the least select of his subjects. But Heine maliciously said that he kept a glove for the purpose.

The Duke was more at home among the people who had learned politics out of books. They whispered in his ear that his countrymen would some day be glad to make a bargain with him, since he was to France what William of Orange had been to England. Their heads were full of our Whig Revolution, and they could spin off at a moment's notice a parallel between James II. and Charles X. The Duc d'Orleans did not make a comparison between himself and "the glorious and immortal memory" of our own Dutch king, but he knew that such a comparison was made. He did not attack the court, but he allowed his attendants to say what they liked about its folly. He did not denounce the bigotry of the King, but he listened with virtuous encouragement when his visitors showed that it was again leading to the way of exile. Let it be said to his credit that he did warn the King in private of the fate which the monarchy was preparing for itself by allowing parliamentary majorities to be over-ridden by heralds and priests. But those who take their political opinions from heralds and priests are not to be checked by worldly wisdom. At last, then, when the court was obviously losing its sense of what was firm ground, and was said to be dancing on a volcano, the Duc d'Orleans put aside his airs of reticence and openly exclaimed, "*Au moins la faute n'en est pas à moi; je n'aurai pas à me reprocher de n'avoir pas essayé d'ouvrir les yeux au roi. . . . Mais que voulez-vous? Rien n'est écouté; et Dieu sait où ils seront dans six mois! Mais,*" added the Duke, "*je sais bien où je serais.*"

Dans tous les cas, ma famille et moi, nous restons dans ce palais. Quelque danger qu'il puisse y avoir, je ne bougerai pas d'ici. Je ne séparerai pas mon sort et celui de mes enfants du sort de mon pays." His sagacious and vigorous sister, Madame Adelaide, said the same thing during the Revolution of 1830, when she declared that the French might make either a king or a national guard of her brother, if they did not make him an exile.

Being determined to stay in France, whoever else might leave it, he naturally made himself agreeable to all who might be expected to remain after the King should go. Thus the Palais Royal threw open its doors to the members of the constitutional opposition, and to all the clever men who did not put their talent under the wing of the Church. If the chief judges of Paris were offended at the Tuileries by the monosyllabic scorn of the Duchesse d'Angoulême, they had only to cross the street to get a boisterous welcome from her Liberal cousin. If the orators of the opposition were hooted in the Chamber, they were soothed and praised and petted in the drawing-rooms of the Palais Royal. Thither came those *Doctrinaires* who understood the British constitution, and prescribed its balm for all the woes of France. Thither came Benjamin Constant, the cleverest literary and parliamentary teacher of the sect; and Manuel, the best debater of the Liberal party, and General Foy, its most eloquent orator, and Casimir-Perier, the great banker and statesman, who was to be the chief Minister of Louis Philippe, and Laffitte, the other great banker and political manager, who was to do more than any other man to give Louis Philippe a throne. The Palais Royal was a coterie of skilful Whigs, firmly convinced that they, and they alone, could "manage" France.

On going a little way farther from the Tuileries, and calling at the hospitable mansion of M. Laffitte himself, we should have found the same personages, mixed with younger, bolder, franker enemies of the Crown. You would have seen among others three men who, each in his way, was to leave a profound mark on the history of France, and to be imperishably connected with her revolutions. One, who was made noticeable by his shrewd, sagacious face, was Béranger, the best political song-writer in the world. His light, airy, perfectly finished verses had carried on the wings of music the praises of liberty, and of Napoleon, and of the grand army, along with satire of the court and the priests, to the homes of every artisan, peasant, shopkeeper, and man of culture. Such songs as *Octavie* and *Le Sacre de Charles le Simple* made him more formidable to the Bourbons than a whole heavy brigade of parliamentary debaters. In the same room you would have seen the austere, haughty face of another man who, although still young, had already displayed commanding literary and political talents, who was for years to be the Prime Minister of Louis Philippe, and who, after



pulling down the constitutional throne by his disdain for popular impulses, was to redeem many political errors by the green and revered old age which some of us have seen, and which all of us connect with the great name of M. Guizot. And there was a third personage, who died only about eighteen months ago, and who is almost as well known in England as in France—a little, squat, restless, undignified figure; a round, spectacled face, blazing with vivacity, self-confidence, vanity, boundless curiosity, boundless talent; a young plebeian from Marseilles, who astonished everybody by his brilliant talk, and who, as Lamartine said, had sufficient gunpowder in his nature to blow up ten houses of Bourbon; the great journalist who was pulling down the throne with the lever of his own maxim, that the king should reign, but not govern; the political leader who was soon to be the most prominent and the most mischievous minister in Europe; the historian who should afterwards debauch the minds of Frenchmen by writing the praises of Napoleon in twenty volumes; the patriot who was to learn political wisdom amid the gilded degradation of the second Empire, when the France of Pascal and Bossuet fell into the keeping of such adventurers as decent people might decline to meet at dinner; the great citizen and statesman who, chastened by the mighty misfortunes of his country, was, under the weight of eighty years, to leave a name which will be gratefully remembered by the latest generations of Frenchmen as the liberator of their territory and the first President of their Republic.

At the house of M. Laffitte and the palace of the Duc d'Orleans, one would have met only the serious political natures, who, like M. Thiers and M. Guizot, had mastered the art of carrying motions in the Chamber of Deputies. All visionaries were coldly warned to be gone. But neither the Duc d'Orleans nor M. Laffitte could speak for the whole of that France which lay outside the court. One great relic of the Revolution still existed in M. de Lafayette, whose enthusiasm for the triumphs of 1789 had never been chilled even by the Reign of Terror, and who was still the same ardent, flighty Republican as he had been when he escorted Louis XVI. to the Tuileries. And there were many still more fervid Frenchmen, who thought that the promise of the millennium had been cut short by the fall of the Convention. There were men who, like Godefroy Cavaignac, found a religion in a Democratic Republic, and who would have gone as gladly to die as any martyr if they might thus plant such a Republic in France. There were not a few devotees of Napoleon who remembered nothing of the Empire but its glory. And outside these small minorities lay that great mute, mysterious mass of Frenchmen who had no political power. Nay, the qualification for the franchise was so high that some of the most eminent Frenchmen might, so late as the closing years of Louis Philippe's reign, have no votes if their wealth was not equal to their ability.

One of these men, M. Cousin, on being asked for his vote by a candidate for a seat in the Chamber of Deputies, satirised the system in words of characteristic scorn: "Monsieur, je suis professeur à la Faculté des Lettres, je suis membre de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, je suis membre de l'Académie Française, je suis membre du Conseil Royal de l'Instruction Publique, je suis pair de France, j'ai été ministre, je puis le redevenir,—mais je ne suis pas électeur." Such a system could not last long in a country which has a greater respect than any other for purely intellectual distinction. Nor could the artisans and the peasantry long be denied political power in a land which more than any other is democratic. Universal suffrage was fated to come by the French love of political equality. We should all of us do well to reflect on the meaning of that love. We sometimes hear that it springs from envy, which is said to be as much the vice of democracies as sycophancy is the vice of aristocratic countries. If such an explanation were true it would be very sad, because nothing can be clearer to any student of history than the fact that the growing and spreading love of equality is the master spirit of this age, and that sooner or later it will revolutionize every land in Europe. But the love of equality has, happily, a worthier root than envy. It comes from a rationalized sentiment of human dignity. It amounts to a refusal to let any one make laws or rule merely because he has some accidental superiority of social station. It amounts to a demand that all who seek to reach political power should present the credentials of their personal fitness at the wicket-gate of public office. It was against the sentiment of equality that the monarchy of the Restoration made war, by reviving as many as possible of the old forms of kingly and aristocratic power. And against the cliff-like strength of that sentiment, the monarchy shattered the fabric of divine right for ever.

Charles X. found out the significance of that fact during the closing years of his reign, for in spite of the Congregation, and of his ceaseless attempts to pack the Chamber of Deputies, the Liberal majorities were constantly increasing. It became clear to him that if he did not put down the Parliament, the Parliament would put him down, by making him as dependent on Ministries as he supposed the King of England to be. He did make a small concession for a moment in allowing a cabinet to be formed by a liberalised conservative, M. de Martignac. He sent for that eloquent deputy in much the same spirit as Marshal MacMahon sent for M. Jules Simon, and then he dismissed him as summarily as Marshal MacMahon sent off the equally eloquent Republican chief. His motto was, *J'y suis, j'y reste*. Resolving to assert his kingly power once for all, he summoned to the head of his council the Prince de Polignac, a less intelligent and more fatal Duc de Broglie. M. de Polignac was one

of those gallant, honest, slightly confused, polite, sincere, admirable, perfectly impracticable zealots, without whom no gentleman's country would be complete, but who are more dangerous than the most hare-brained or unscrupulous dealer in the drugs of popular violence. Believing that the French Revolution had opened the sluices of the nether pit, and that they might be opened again by Parliamentary majorities, he determined to keep them down with the strong hand of kingly power. At the same time he meant to be perfectly loyal to the constitution, and he passionately assured his friends and his foes that he was an honest man. But he put himself on the slippery incline of personal government, and he forgot that a very slight movement, an involuntary step, the push of an enemy, the pull of a friend, might serve to make him illustrate the law which marks the momentum of falling bodies.

No sooner had he become Prime Minister, than everybody foresaw a struggle which might end in civil war. "Unhappy France! unhappy King!" was the prophetic exclamation of the *Journal des Débats*. The Chamber of Deputies made a memorable protest; the King answered by an equally memorable dissolution; and the country retorted by sending back a still more memorable majority of Liberals. Charles opened the session in a menacing speech; but it was noticed that, as he was about to step down from the throne, his hat fell off, and that it was picked up by the Duc d'Orleans, who returned it on bended knee. Bad omens go for much in a feverish atmosphere.

M. de Polignac tried, meanwhile, to charm the constituencies by the glories of a spirited foreign policy. Believing that France had been degraded by ignoble peace, and that the people were disgusted by the cowardice of past ministers, he wanted to change the map of Europe by the force of the Eastern Question. But, as the rulers of other lands were unwilling to hazard universal war, he resolved that, rather than waste the running force of military ambition, he should "drive into something cheap." So, taking advantage of a wretched little dispute with a wretched little potentate in Algeria, he fitted out a big expedition amid the sound of many trumpets, won a tremendous victory over his half-barbarous foe, and annexed the territory which he had invaded for the defence of French interests. But the Liberals and the great mass of the people refused to be pacified by the splendid "scientific frontier" which they had found on the other side of the Mediterranean. They wanted some homely rights, rather than the right to spend money and be despots among tribes whom most of them should never see. Another dissolution brought up an equally compact Liberal majority. So the King thought that the only way to "save society" was to make a *coup d'état*. Accordingly, at the Palace of St. Cloud, near Paris, after hearing mass on Sunday, the 25th of July, 1830—a memorable

day in the history of Europe—he and his ministers signed three famous ordinances—stopping the freedom of the press, dissolving a Chamber which had never met, and radically changing its composition. Had he any constitutional right to make these edicts? The Liberals said that he had not; but he appealed to an ambiguous clause in the charter, and it is possible that if he had been able to command the consummate forensic powers of Lord Cairns, he could have shown that no constitutional trivialities can take away from adventurous ministers the right to enjoy the luxury of absolute power. There is, however, such a thing as political atmosphere, no less than political edicts. What a nation may languidly allow when its moral pulse is feeble, it will fight to stop when the iron of a sense of duty has entered into its soul.

That is what the King was now to find. When the ordinances were published on the morning of Monday, the 26th of July, they instantly threw Paris into a state of revolutionary turmoil. The chief journalists, with M. Thiers at their head, met and signed a famous declaration that they would not obey edicts which, they maintained, broke the pledges of the charter. A court of justice took occasion to affirm that the ordinances were illegal. When the police came to break, and thus stop, the press of a rebellious journal, the manager confronted them with the Criminal code in his hand, and warned the workman whom they employed that he was making himself liable to imprisonment with hard labour. M. Laffitte, M. Casimir-Perier, M. Guizot, and the other leaders of the Opposition met with some vague and contradictory ideas of protesting or insisting. Scenting revolution, M. de Lafayette ran to Paris, and his great reputation gave a central figure to the party of resistance. All business was at a stand-still; the manufacturers closed their doors and poured their workmen into the streets; the chief thoroughfares were thronged with an angry multitude; the students of the Polytechnic School broke out of bounds and offered to lead the people; the National Guards seized their weapons to protect their property; companies of dragoons tried to clear the streets; a shot went off near the Théâtre Français; the first blood was spilled; and the tempest of civil war was let loose. For three days did the capital ring with that terrible conflict which is commemorated by the proud column that now rises from the Place de la Bastille, in Paris.

Charles had no sooner signed the ordinances than he had gone to hunt at Rambouillet, but his attendants noticed that for once he was listless amid the pleasures of the chase, and that he allowed the stag to get away. His ill-luck in the forest was emblematic of his misfortunes in Paris. The number of troops in the capital was not sufficient to put down the crowds of armed Parisians—boys and old men, artisans and shopkeepers, and fashionably dressed youths, grave fathers of families, barristers, young pupils of the military schools, and young

students of law, among whom was Jules Grévy, now the President of the French Republic. These volunteers fought with desperate courage. The troops had neither provisions, water, good guidance, nor the sense that right was on their side. It was clear that the victory would fall to the Parisians even before the Louvre was taken ; it was clear that nothing could save the monarchy but the instant withdrawal of the ordinances and the dismissal of the Ministry ; and the best friends of the throne sent one frantic message after another to St. Cloud, where Charles was staying. And what, meanwhile, was his Majesty doing, as the dull roar of the cannon was borne to the palace, as hundreds of brave men were dying in defence of his throne or of their own civil rights, as the courtiers formed silent and anxious groups, and as messengers came black with powder and half famished from the warring capital ? His Majesty was playing whist ! He was every inch a Bourbon.

Even Charles had to give way at last, and, roused from his bed on the night of Friday, the 30th of July, he signed a decree revoking the ordinances, and forming a Liberal Ministry. But it was too late. The Parisians were determined that he should never come back to the capital. Going to Rambouillet, he tried to save at least his dynasty. He himself abdicated on the 2nd of August. On the same day his unpopular but obedient son, the Duc d'Angoulême, renounced his rights as the heir. At the same time the throne was conferred on the King's young grandson, the Duc de Bordeaux, now known as the Comte de Chambord, and the Duc d'Orleans was appointed Lieutenant-General of the kingdom until the Prince should come of age. All that was done on paper, but again it was too late. The Liberal Deputies passionately urged the Duc d'Orleans to accept the vacant throne in order to prevent the establishment of a Republic. Lafayette was won over to their side, and the Duc d'Orleans was styled the best of Republics. Talleyrand, the undertaker of every fallen government, sent the little message, *Qu'il accepte*. The Duke after a struggle with the claims of gratitude which he owed to Charles, did accept ; the Chamber of Deputies proclaimed him King of the French, and the power of the grandest of all dynasties passed away for ever.

But Charles acted with kingly stateliness down to the very day when he left the soil of France for the last time. It was necessary that he should quit the country, and it was arranged that he should embark at Cherbourg. From his starting point at Rambouillet to that port, the distance, as the crow flies, may be about one hundred and sixty or one hundred and seventy miles ; but the ex-King went with royal slowness of pomp, and it took him almost a fortnight to reach the place of embarkation. He went, accompanied by his family, by the members of his household, by his guards, and by the commissioners of the new sovereign, who, in truth, were his only

real protection. He went at a foot-pace, sometimes through pitying, and sometimes through sullen crowds; but he met with no insult, although most of the people would have lynched the Prince de Polignac and his colleagues. He was saved from injury by the popular comprehension of the maxim which he himself had denounced, that the King reigns, but does not govern. Perhaps the King's stately slowness was partially caused by a hope that Brittany and La Vendée would be fired by the memory of Charette and Cathélineau, and would have time to strike for the throne of St. Louis; but in the main it was doubtless a pure token of the King's respect for his office. One of his attendants was so shocked by the refusal of the people of Dreux to treat it with equal respect, that he went out of his mind. At Laigle other attendants found that the King could not dine, because the hotel in which he lodged had only round tables, and no tables, therefore, of which his Majesty could take the head. But the democratic curves were speedily cut away by Royalist saws, and the extemporised rectangles allowed the King to dine without a fatal loss of dignity. The little fair-haired Duc de Bordeaux and his sister, meanwhile, added an infantile pathos to the wreck of royalty, for they had been taught to bow to the people in their better days, and, thinking that the procession to the coast was nothing more than a stately pageant, they cast their small, smiling gestures among the silent crowd that lined the highway, and made tears start to the eyes of the rough Norman folk. Poor little remnants of a great dynasty, they were shedding their childish bounties for the last time among their own people. The Duchesse d'Angoulême, meanwhile, went with austere and silent grief, amid pitying enemies, on the way to her third and final exile. And the King, before parting with Louis Philippe's protecting commissioner, M. Odilon-Barrot, left a touching token of the political philosophy which had lured him to ruin. Speaking of the Revolution, he said, "I know all the threads of the conspiracy which has been woven. I could name the banker who has paid for the whole of the popular movement." That is to say, men had died by hundreds in the streets of Paris, and a throne had been flung down, our own first Reform Bill had been brought nearer to triumph, and Europe had been shaken from end to end, because M. Laffitte had flung about some gold! It would not be easy to find a more instructive comment in the whole range of courtly literature. Charles felt bound by motives of kingly and Catholic honour to cure those impulses of freedom which mean the impulses of human dignity. He was the best judge of his own honour. But the French were also the best judges of their own dignity; and there was no room in France for him and them.

JAMES MACDONELL.

## THE KNOWN AND THE UNKNOWN IN THE ECONOMIC WORLD.

THE most characteristic feature of the commercial situation for more than a year past has been not so much the depth of the depression, for there have been worse times in that respect; or its extent, for the stagnation was as general throughout Europe, and much more widely felt throughout France, thirty years ago—as the sense of being in the dark, and surrounded as it were by the unknown. Yet it is the consciousness only of not seeing their way on the part of people that is new. Trade has long been carried on blindly, and people as little knew what was before them when it was said to be advancing by leaps and bounds as they do now that these are found to have been leaps in the dark. Temporary circumstances have added to the gloom and uncertainty, and it is ascribable in part to a false economic theory; but to get a ray of light we must first recognise that the obscurity of the present crisis has arisen in a great measure from causes inherent in the constitution of the modern economic world. It is not the writer's purpose to inquire whether in the most vital sense the present depression is temporary or permanent. Our manufacture and commerce may or may not recover their vigour and supremacy. Our agriculture may or may not be overborne finally by American competition. The chief point to which attention is sought here is that even in the most favourable event elements of disorder, difficulty, and recurring disaster, which have been growing with the growth of our trade, will remain, unless new sources of light can be discovered. Another point that should not be left unnoticed is that the economic world is not bounded by its trade, and has other regions in which to add to the known, and diminish the unknown, ought to be the economist's aim.

The full knowledge and foreknowledge lately claimed for political economy in modern commercial society, can exist only at an opposite stage of development, at which human business and conduct are determined, not by individual choice, or the pursuit of wealth, or commercial principles, but by immemorial ancestral custom. All that relates to the occupations and movements of a nomad tribe in Central Asia is known and foreknown by all its members, who possess the power of prediction, which Mr. Lowe calls the test of science. "Every tribe and every awl," says a recent traveller among the Kirghis, "follows year after year the same itinerary, pursuing the same paths, stopping at the same wells as their ancestors did a thousand years ago. No awl ever mistakes its way. The regularity

and exactitude of the movement is such that you can predict to a day where, in a circuit of several hundred miles, any awl will be at any season of the year." At the more advanced stage of early agricultural society the power of prediction continues, and is not destroyed by disturbing causes of a more abnormal and violent character than the follower of the *a priori* method of political economy has in view in the phrase. Dynasties rise and fall, conquerors come and go, empires are shattered above the head of the village community, yet it survives unchanged. The village itself may be burned, its lands laid waste, the inhabitants driven away for a generation, but another generation returns and resumes the old life, each man following the occupation of his fathers, pursuing the same methods, and seldom being either richer or poorer than they. It is in what Mr. Bagehot called a pre-economic state, though it is more properly regarded as an early state of the economic world, among stationary communities—where "the thing that hath been is that which shall be, and that which is done is that which shall be done, and there is no new thing under the sun"—that "knowledge in its most perfect form as tested by prediction" exists. And just in proportion as the stationary passes into the progressive condition, as industry and commerce are developed, does the social economy become complex, diversified, changeful, uncertain, unpredictable, and hard to know even in its existing phase at any given time. In the primitive village community the prices of commodities and the gains of producers are not only known, but foreknown, because they are customary prices. But when a market grows up on the border, where dealings with strangers are unrestricted by the tie of kinship or community, or by usage, the prices at which things are bought and sold can no longer be known beforehand, and are not even necessarily known to every one afterwards. Another element of uncertainty introducing itself so soon as traffic with the outer world begins, is that production can no longer be exactly adjusted to consumption, supply to demand, both the number and the means of customers from without being unknown. And as industrial development proceeds, as labour is subdivided and occupations multiply and the methods of production improve, as commerce enlarges its borders and changes its paths, the unknown more and more takes the place of the known. The desire of wealth, or of its representative money, instead of enabling the economist to foretell values and prices, destroys the power of prediction that formerly existed, because it is the mainspring of industrial and commercial activity and progress, of infinite variety and incessant alteration in the structure and operations of the economic world. For more than a hundred years before Adam Smith's birth, the rate of wages might have been nearly foretold throughout most of Scotland, and in parts of the Highlands, down



to the time when the *Wealth of Nations* was written. But so soon as commercial activity began to stir in the Lowlands, the price of labour became variable and uncertain. The philosopher relates: "In the last century the most usual day-wages of common labour through the greater part of Scotland were sixpence in summer and fivepence in winter. Three shillings a week, the same price very nearly, still continues to be paid in some parts of the Highlands and Western Islands. Through the greater part of the low country the most usual wages of common labour are now eightpence a day, tenpence, sometimes a shilling, in the counties which border on England, and in a few other places where there has lately been a rise in the demand for labour, about Glasgow, Carron, &c."<sup>1</sup> Had Arthur Young foretold the rates of agricultural wages in England in 1868 from those which he found prevalent in 1768, the prediction would have proved nearly correct in the stationary southern counties, though utterly false in the mining and manufacturing counties north of the Trent.

It is thus a fundamental error of the *a priori* or deductive political economy that it takes no cognizance of the cardinal fact that the movement of the economic world has been one from simplicity to complexity, from uniformity to diversity, from unbroken custom to change, and therefore from the known to the unknown. The origin of the error is in part traceable to the extreme slowness and almost imperceptible character of the movement down to the age of steam. Adam Smith's own theory of wages, profits, and prices rested on the assumption that employments in general were long established, well known, and undergoing no change, and was expressly restricted to such. The immobility of the world he lived in shows itself in an observation of his great contemporary, Hume: "In five hundred years the posterity of those in the coaches and those on the boxes will probably have changed places." Hume seems to have taken for granted that, five centuries after his time, the same sort of coaches would travel on the same sort of road, the only change being in the places of the passengers inside and out. An age of iron, however, succeeded to his age of wood; the age of iron is already giving place to an age of steel, and who now attempts to forecast the modes of conveyance five centuries, or even five generations, hence? "*De minimis non curat lex*," said Mr. Mill in the House of Commons, citing the legal maxim adroitly in reference to the small importation of meat little more than a decade ago. Now nearly one-fourth of the animal food consumed in the kingdom comes from abroad, and even live beasts are largely imported. The extension, again, of the area of trade has brought with it liability to countless unforeseen and sudden changes, rendering it impossible to adjust supply to

(1) *Wealth of Nations*, Book i. c. 8.

demand. Not only a great war, like the Franco-German, disturbs the calculations of merchants and manufacturers; the outbreak of the present Zulu war led to the sudden countermanding of large orders for sheep-shears, wire fencing, and edge-tools for the Cape. Credit adds another unknown quantity. It springs from the growth of confidence between man and man, and of foresight, in one sense; yet it greatly augments the uncertainty of trade, the difficulty of anticipating the future, and the chance of expectations being frustrated by fraud. So long as goods are sold only for cash, prices are fixed by the pecuniary means of purchasers, and are subject to comparatively little variation of demand; as soon, too, as the sale is effected, the amount of the seller's profit is certain. But when once promises to pay acquire a purchasing power, the fluctuations of prices have no assignable limit, and a promised payment may never be made, so that after parting with his goods the producer's profit still remains doubtful. Not only the future, but even the present becomes inscrutable in a highly advanced community. The number of employments is so great, each of them is so intricate a business and affected by such a variety of conditions, the fortunes of the individuals engaged in them are so diverse, that no one dreams of surveying the entire field; he often cannot tell even how the people he deals with himself, and to whom he is perhaps making large advances, are doing. The banker of fifty years ago, in Mr. Bagehot's words, "formed his judgment of the solvency of those to whom he lent. And when London was by comparison a small city, this practice might have been safe. But now that London is enormous, and that no one can watch any one, such a trade would be disastrous; at present it would hardly be safe in a country town." In the same work, *Lombard Street*, Mr. Bagehot lays stress on the extent, beyond the conception of our ancestors, to which English trade is carried on by borrowed capital. It is a surprising instance of the force of a foregone conclusion that this acute thinker did not see how inconsistent this fact was, by his own showing, with the doctrine of an equality of profits to which he adhered. "A new man, with a small capital of his own and a large borrowed capital, can undersell a rich man who depends on his own capital only. The rich man wants the full mercantile rate of profit; but the poor man wants only interest on much of what he uses." The man who trades with his own capital thus can no longer count on what Mr. Bagehot calls the full mercantile rate of profit. But the new system introduces much else that disturbs the old order of things. Did "the new man" take as much care of the capital he borrows as if it were his own, he would not treat the whole surplus of his gross profit above interest as at his disposal, either to lower prices or to spend. He may be unexpectedly called on to refund what he has borrowed, his credit may

be shaken, a hundred unlooked-for events may subject him to pressure, his position is far more precarious than that of the man with funds of his own, and he ought to provide an insurance fund in proportion. But he risks other people's money, not his own; if he loses it all, he is at the worst no poorer than when he began, after perhaps living like a lord in the meanwhile, and it will go hard with him if he does not save something out of the fire for himself. At a much earlier stage of the economic world a man ran some risk of being robbed of all his money; but he seldom ran any of losing it in a trade speculation. We talk of modern security of property in comparison with the Middle Ages; yet it would be much to say that the wealth of a modern capitalist is as secure as that of a stout franklin in the worst days of the Plantagenets.

Professor Nasse of Bonn, replying in a recent essay to the Socialistic doctrine that, under State regulation, production might be so adjusted to consumption and supply to demand as to render industrial crises impossible, observes that such an adjustment, without individual freedom in respect either of production or consumption, is not inconceivable, though on terms involving the destruction of civilisation and all that makes life worth having. "But to reconcile it with individual freedom is a problem comparable only with the quadrature of the circle. All the operations of fixed capital, ships, railways, factories, mines, involve production for the future, and how is the future to be foreseen?"<sup>1</sup> One may add that the "orthodox" theory of prices and profits is as inconsistent as the Socialistic programme with individual liberty. It is a curious characteristic of the deductive political economy, that in spite of its show of logic, its followers have never firmly grasped either their own premisses or their conclusions. With Mr. Senior and Mr. Lowe they suppose for the most part that the assumption on which their theory of value rests, is a universal desire of wealth. Indeed some who no longer contend that the whole economic world can be isolated for the investigation of its laws from the moral and political world, are still disposed to hold that there is a department of economic phenomena, namely, that of commercial exchanges, values, and prices, the laws of which may be deduced from the single motive of pecuniary gain. No theory whatever nevertheless is deducible from that motive alone. You may know that everybody you meet between Belgrave Square and the Bank loves wealth of some sort, and money as the means of purchasing all sorts, but what can you infer from that with respect to any one's conduct, or part in either production or distribution? Can you infer either that the Duke of Westminster will, or that he will not sweep a crossing for sixpence? The late Lord Derby is said

(1) *Ueber die Verhütung der Produktionskrisen durch staatliche Fürsorge.* Von Dr. Erwin Nasse. Heltzsdorff Brentano Jahrbuch III. i.

to have replied to an engineer who urged that a particular line of railway would add ten thousand a year to his rental—"How do you know that I care to have ten thousand a year added to my rental?" The economist, however, need not ascend to so lofty a region, or perplex himself with so transcendental a question. He may take it for granted, like the engineer, that people do care for ten thousand a year. Mr. Lowe's doctrine is not wholly unfounded, that the general love of money enables the economist to foretell human conduct. Just as from the strength of the impulses to marriage, together with observation of their consequences, you may predict that, other circumstances remaining the same, nearly the same number of young men in business will marry this year as last, so from the strength in this country of pecuniary interest and the course of conduct it has been found for centuries to lead to, you may predict that if business does not greatly fall off, about the same number of young men will go into it this year as last. For fresh youth recruits the commercial world every year—not every tenth year only, as a cyclical theorist naively persists. But you can no more predict from their love of money what prices and profits the young men will get in their business, than from their love of fair women what fortunes they will get with their wives. And you might as well assume that, allowing for difference of age, looks, family, and other attractions, the fortunes the wives bring will be equal, as that allowing, according to the orthodox formula, for differences in the nature of their employment, they will make equal rates of profit on their capital. Here the real main postulate of the deductive economist comes in. They cannot, he says, make a higher rate of profit in one business than in another, because other people will not allow that if they know it, but will cut in at once. And he assumes that they do know it. He assumes that the choice of occupations and investments, and the movements of labour and capital, are determined by knowledge so accurate that the result is the same percentage of profit on capital all round, and a scale of comparative prices in proportion to the quantity and quality of the labour and sacrifices required to produce commodities, or their comparative cost of production. He predicts, in short, that the price of any given article will be such as to give average profit to its producers after paying the labourers average wages. If you object that prices fluctuate in the most unforeseen manner, that producers, so far from all getting "average" profits, meet with the most different fortunes, some being ruined, and some becoming millionaires, his excuse is ready. Political economy, he tells you, with an air of offended dignity, is a science of tendencies in the long run, and in the absence of disturbing causes; it does not predict in individual cases. A great general used to say that a man who was good at excuses was never

good for anything else, and nearly as much may be said of a theory. But the deductive economist has really no title to the excuse, such as it is. His theory of profits and prices, when examined, will be found to claim to be true under all circumstances, in the case of every individual in trade, and of every particular article, and to foretell the exact rates at which goods will be sold. His theory of taxation is an application of his theory of profits and prices, and it proceeds on the assumption that prices will actually conform to the cost of production so nicely in every particular case, that every special tax on any commodity will be recovered by the producer from the consumer, with a profit on the advance. No one was less disposed than Mr. Mill to strain the orthodox system till it cracked, and in his chapter on the relation of cost of production to value, it is somewhat vaguely laid down that, as a general rule, things tend to exchange at such values, that is to sell at such prices, as will enable each producer to be repaid the cost of production with ordinary profit. But when he comes to taxes on commodities, he affirms, in accordance with the orthodox theory, that "there are but two cases in which duties on commodities can in any degree or in any manner fall on the producer." The excepted cases do not concern the question; and in the case of customs and excise duties, trade licenses, and various stamp duties, taxes, and rates, the strict theory is that a producer recovers all special taxation, with a profit in every particular instance. No disturbing causes can be pleaded, nor can the trader obtain a postponement of taxation until it becomes certain that he will be recouped by his customers.

The orthodox, *a priori*, or deductive system thus postulates much more than a general desire of wealth. It postulates also such full knowledge of the gains in different employments, and such facility of choice and change of employment, that any special tax can be evaded or shifted. A case where the conditions seem sufficiently realised will illustrate the matter. Indoor and outdoor servants meet in the same establishments, and are in the closest relations; they know each other's wages, perquisites, and circumstances exactly; and the classes recruiting them both are the same, and equally well informed. The son of the gamekeeper, gardener, coachman, or groom knows as well as the butler and footman how the indoor servants are off; and he knows that if the duties were abolished, the condition of outdoor servants and labourers, who buy their own tea and beer, would be improved. It is therefore a reasonable inference that masters who supply these articles to their indoor servants, give, or may give if they like, lower wages in consequence of the duties, and that indoor wages would rise if the duties were taken off, so that their real incidence may be said to be on the servants. To confound this case with that of so-called indirect taxes in general, as a recent

writer has done,<sup>1</sup> is to fall into the fundamental error of the *a priori* system of confounding the unknown with the known in the economic world. The farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, the innkeeper, the grocer, the tobaccoist, the publican, do not know the profits of other businesses, and are to a very small extent recruited from the same classes. Farmers, for instance, as Mr. Bear says, "as a rule do not go out of farming until they are ruined. Most of them know no other means of getting a living, without sinking into the position of stewards and bailiffs, a class far too numerous already." Again, the master can stop the amount of the duties at the time he pays his servants their wages, whereas a trader's premises may be burnt down, or he may become bankrupt the week after his rates and taxes are paid, and before the sale of any part of his stock; the payment indeed may be the last straw that breaks an overburdened back. Many men in trade during the last four years have failed to recover their taxes in prices, because they have failed altogether.

Adam Smith's economic theory was mainly a theory of production and abundance, or, in his own words, of "the great multiplication of the productions of all the different arts in consequence of the division of labour, which occasions that universal opulence which extends itself to the lowest ranks of the people." With distribution by means of exchange he was concerned chiefly as promoting the division of labour, and thereby the plenty and variety of commodities. With Ricardo distribution, as he states in his preface, became the chief problem, and he elaborated a theory of exchange values, wages, profits, and prices, irreconcilable with the fundamental principles of Adam Smith's theory of production. Industrial liberty and the division of labour, the two pillars of Adam Smith's system, produce an economic world, the vastness, complexity, and incessant changes of which are absolutely incompatible with the main postulates of the Ricardian theory, that the advantages and disadvantages of all the different occupations are known, that competition equalises the rewards of both labour and abstinence, and that the prices of commodities therefore are determined by the respective cost of production. The whole deductive theory of distribution rests on that postulate. It is, indeed, because so much has been built on it that scrutiny of the ground it stands on is resisted and resented. The system rests on the wrong end, the superstructure supporting the foundation. For though it is true in logic as in mechanics, that nothing is stronger than its weakest part, it is not so in matters of opinion, whether in politics, religion, or philosophy. A seemingly symmetrical system has in itself charms for many minds, and the interests bound up with orthodox economics are various and strong. The opponent of direct taxation, for instance, is well pleased with a

(1) Mr. H. Sidgwick, *Fortnightly Review*, February, 1879, p. 304.

system which teaches that taxes on trade and commodities fall with perfect equality; and had not their inequality been thus put out of sight, Mr. Gladstone could hardly have dreamt of the enterprise of abolishing the Income Tax.

In Adam Smith's time a revolt against the blundering interference of the State led by reaction, in both England and France, to an overweening trust in the enlightenment and sagacity of individual interest, with which the notion of a keen insight into the condition of every employment was in harmony. But there was also in a comparatively small, simple, and stationary economic world better reason to assume the existence of such insight. It might, for example, be not irrationally conjectured that in a little village at the present day every man knows all his neighbours' affairs. To jump from that to the conclusion that everybody in England knows the affairs of everybody else is the leap that Ricardo and his followers have made. The present writer, after personal inquiry some years ago in villages and small towns within the United Kingdom and on the Continent, was led to doubt that even in a modern village is there such a knowledge of profits as the deductive economist assumes. The village innkeeper, publican, or shopkeeper who is making a small fortune does not invite competition by telling his neighbours of his profits, and the man who is not doing well does not alarm his creditors by exposing the state of his affairs. If you take a whole country like England, it becomes a matter of accident, situation, and personal history and connection, what a man knows about the state of any particular business. There are people in London and elsewhere who know more about the state of trade and the openings for capital and enterprise in California, China, and Japan, or some South American State, than in their own country, and who could more easily make their own way, or push on their sons or their nephews, in a place some thousand miles off than in their own town. The distinction which Mr. Mill has drawn between international trade and home trade, in respect of the transferability of labour and capital and the equalisation of wages and profit, if it had once some foundation when trade at home was simpler and better known, and when foreign countries were almost wholly unknown, cannot now be sustained. Not that the doctrine of the equality of profits and of the determination of comparative prices by comparative cost of production is now applicable to both, but that it is applicable to neither. It was a step in the right direction to recognise its inapplicability to the exchanges between different countries, but the further step is now required of abandoning it altogether.

In both home trade and international trade the migration of labour and capital has some effect on wages and profits, and the comparative cost of producing different commodities some effect on their compara-

tive value and price, but in both cases the effect is uncertain, irregular, and incalculable. In neither case is there an equalisation of either wages or profits; in neither case do prices conform to the Ricardian law of cost. If a particular business is known, or believed to be flourishing, capital flows into it, but it flows also into businesses that are, in reality, very unprosperous. One has only to keep one's eyes open in the streets of London to see, year after year, shops fail, disappear, and reappear with another name over the window, though the locality evidently does not support them. Save in so far as the prosperity of their own business depends on that of others, the people in one trade know little or nothing of the condition of other trades, or no more than the newspapers tell them. So far, too, is the producer of one article from knowing the cost of every other, that often he does not know what the cost of his own commodity is to other producers in the same business. That varies with the method they follow, their situation, connection, and the rapidity of their returns, the solvency of the people they give credit to, and the number of bad debts, their own credit, the economy, the skill, care, and invention exerted by both themselves and those under them, luck, and many other conditions. Ricardo and his followers have assumed labour to be the only element in the cost of production, and the only productive power; and the notion has had pernicious consequences. Capitalists have been led by it to look to reduction of wages as the only means of keeping up profit, and labourers to suppose that every increase of profit must have arisen from their own work, and be at their cost. All the sophistry in the literature of Socialism has not given birth to a more mischievous fallacy than that contained in the Ricardian dogma—"the rate of profit is never increased by a better distribution of labour, by the invention of machinery, or by any means of abridging labour, either in the manufacture or the conveyance of goods. These are causes which operate on price, and are beneficial to consumers, but they have no effect whatever on profit. On the other hand, every diminution in the wages of labour raises profit."<sup>1</sup> A capitalist, no less than a statesman, may, by taking thought, add a cubit to his stature. He may diminish his outgoings and augment his returns without lowering wages. The soil, the seed, the animals, the coal, the machinery, the chemical agents that capitalists employ, have productive powers; their own brains have productive powers; and all these forces may be made, by skill and economy, to produce more at less cost. Mr. Mill made, doubtless, an important correction of Ricardo's language in saying that the rate of profit depends, not on wages, but on the cost of labour; but the cost of labour is only one of several conditions affecting the result.

(1) McCulloch's Edition of Ricardo's Works, p. 49.



What is or may be known generally, with respect to commodities, is not the cost—still less the profit—of producing them, but their actual market price. People in a particular trade may further know what profit a particular price yields to themselves, though the same price may give very different profits to different producers. People outside the trade, again, may know whether the present prices of the things produced in it are above or below the usual level. But not even the people in the trade can know what the price will be six months hence. When the price of an article, say coal or iron, is above the usual level, capital is attracted to its production, and bills increase in the business; but no examination of the entire field of employment is made or attempted. In truth, the choice of employment runs in a very narrow groove. There is, no doubt, a tendency of trades to localise themselves, like cotton manufacture in Lancashire, in the places with the best natural aptitudes for them. But in the degree and manner in which this localisation takes place, it is largely the result of want of information, and want of originality and enterprise, and is far from effecting the best distribution of industry. Men follow each other like sheep in flocks, though the sheep are not wise in inferring that wherever there is enough good grass for a few, there must be plenty for the whole flock that goes after them. Belfast is well situated for the manufacture of linen, and has a trained population, with hereditary aptitudes; but that is far from affording adequate reason for the fact that almost every one there with capital has, for the last two generations, gone into linen, for the place and people have capacities for other manufactures. The Belfast people have put almost all their eggs in one basket. There has been a great over-production of linen; and the case is only one of many showing that Chancellor Oxenstiern's saying, "*Quantulâ sapientiâ regitur mundus*," is as true of the commercial as it is of the political world.

Instead of the world of light, order, equality, and perfect organization, which orthodox political economy postulates, the commercial world is thus one of obscurity, confusion, haphazard, in which, amid much destruction and waste, there is by no means always a survival of the fittest, even though cunning be counted among the conditions of fitness. "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor yet riches to men of understanding, but time and chance happeneth to them all." The part of chance in the matter is really so great, the venture so often chiefly at other people's risk—and the ramifications of commercial relations and credit, the sudden changes in the activity of business and in demand, the fluctuations of prices, make the trader's fortune dependent on so many other conditions than his own skill and care—that not a few hardly try to exercise judgment or foresight. The Duke of Wellington is said to have

replied to a lady who besought him to tell her how the battle of Waterloo was won: "Well, madam, we pounded, and they pounded, and we pounded the hardest." If the story is correct, the Duke probably thought no better account of a battle intelligible to a woman; but many men nowadays seem of opinion that the only way to succeed in the battle of life is to pound the hardest as long as they can, especially if they can do so with metal from other people's magazines. The very word speculation has undergone a perceptible change of meaning, denoting something much nearer gambling than it once did. Adam Smith spoke of certain employments in his day as lotteries—"the lottery of the law," "the lottery of the sea," for example—and of the absurd presumption of mankind in their own good fortune in respect of such lotteries. Now almost every trade has become a lottery, and human presumption has in no respect diminished.

The ignorance and blindness with which modern trade is carried on are, as the foregoing pages have shown, partly inevitable and irremediable, resulting as they do to a great extent from the consequences of industrial and commercial progress on the one hand, and the limitation of human faculties on the other. So much could never be known, in a free and progressive world, of the condition and prospects of every employment, nor could the transfer of labour and capital become so easy as to produce an approximation to the equality in the rate of profit imagined by the orthodox economist. His system has indeed done much to defeat itself and to aggravate the obscurity, disorder, and inequality. By assuming that the laws determining profits, prices, and the division of employment are fully understood, and pursuing the method of deduction from arbitrary assumptions to the neglect of the investigation of facts, he has left us in darkness with respect to many matters as to which the economic world might be less unknown than it is. Arthur Young's *Tours*, Tooke's *History of Prices*, Porter's *Progress of the Nation*, Thorold Rogers's *History of Agriculture and Prices*, Caird's *English Agriculture in 1850*, the so-called *Domesday Books*, inaccurate as they are, the *Agricultural Statistics*, and those relating to trade and to income, together with the reports of many Parliamentary Committees, afford an example of the facts that might be gathered, marshalled, and sifted. We might by this time have an almost complete industrial and commercial map of the kingdom, showing, for the last forty years, the distribution of trades, the changes in the methods of both manufacture and farming, the migration of their sites, the new employments invented, the number of persons in every employment in each successive year, the fluctuations in the prices of both commodities and labour, not in the chief markets only, but in every town and parish, and the main changes that have taken place

in the nature, amount, and distribution of national wealth and their causes. Mr. Bagehot, criticising the plea of a German economist and statist, Dr. Gustav Cohn, for a close investigation of all facts relating to banking and other departments of industrial and commercial economy, called it, by way of disparagement, "the all-case method," affirming that no discovery was ever so made. It would be nearer the truth to say that no discovery was ever made by the no-case method. To imagine that a clever man with his eyes shut can think out the laws of the economic world, is as reasonable as to suppose that he could in the same manner discover the laws of the physical world. In chemistry, in natural history, in physiology, in physical astronomy, discoveries are made every year by the all-case method—by neglecting no phenomenon as unworthy of observation, and investigating every case that presents itself, with a view to ascertaining its causes and laws. The economist might acquire by this method something of the faculty of prediction which Mr. Lowe claims for him. The relation, for example, between the economy and the law of a country, and between the movements of both, is one of the cases in which a power of prevision may be acquired by the inductive method. When Mr. Lowe affirms that political economy is the only department of political and moral science in which prediction is possible, he forgets that all the laws of civilised society are based on the assumption that the conduct of the great majority of its members can be foretold, that they will obey the laws, and that certain consequences, moral, political, and economic, will ensue. Were it otherwise, the desires of which the various kinds of wealth are the objects, would lead, not to industry and commerce, but only to plunder and theft. In relation to the present depression of trade, an instance may be given of the power of prediction the lawyer possesses. As Auguste Comte well said, to predict the future you must be able to predict the past, where your predictions can be verified and your method put to the test. The following prediction of the past, proving a power of predicting the future, is in point. Not long ago an eminent economic authority, Mr. Jevons, referred, in a letter in the *Times*, to the number of bankruptcies in the United States in 1878, in support of his theory of a decennial solar cycle resulting in regular periods of depression and commercial crises. An eminent legal authority, on the other hand, Mr. Francis Reilly, observed at once to the present writer that Mr. Jevons should have inquired whether anything besides the number of sun-spots had changed, adding that the American bankruptcy law varied, and as in this country the number of bankruptcies varied with the law, he believed it would be found to be so in the United States. Soon afterwards facts were published, proving that this prediction of the past was well founded, that the great number of American

bankruptcies last year arose from the desire of debtors to take advantage of an expiring Act—too liberal to defaulting traders—and that Mr. Reilly might draw an Act that would much diminish the number of fraudulent bankruptcies in England, and possibly baffle Mr. Jevons's solar cycle in 1888.

Again, although the modern commercial world is by its nature and constitution, by the ever-increasing extent of its area, not only one of perpetual change, but liable to sudden and unforeseen disturbances, yet the very perception of this fact and of its causes gives a power of prevision. A curious and instructive example of the error of the *a priori* economist on this point will be found in Ricardo's chapter on natural and market price. He could not shut his eyes altogether to the fact that there were fluctuations in prices and profits, disturbing the order and equality his theory assumed, and was compelled to admit that the termination of the great war with France, for example, had deranged the previous distribution of employments in Europe and destroyed some of the occupations of capital.<sup>1</sup> But he proceeded at once to set aside such changes in his exposition of the laws of wages, people, and prices, on the assumption that they were equally operative in all stages of society; an assumption absolutely false in itself, and assuredly not a reason for leaving the phenomena in question out of consideration, had it been true. "Having," he says, "fully acknowledged the temporary effects which, in particular employments, may be produced on the prices of commodities as well as on the wages of labour, and the profits of stock, by accidental causes, *since these effects are equally operative in all stages of society*, we will leave them entirely out of our consideration, whilst we are treating of the laws which regulate natural prices, natural wages, and natural profits."<sup>2</sup> That is to say, in discussing the natural as distinguished from the positive laws governing the distribution of wealth, he ignored the essential difference between stationary and progressive society, between the ancient economic world, with its simple and customary methods and prices, and the modern with its vastness, complexity, incessant movement, and sudden vicissitudes and fluctuations. The changes which he set aside as the results of "accidental causes," were mainly the natural and inevitable consequences of the constitution and course of the economic world in which he lived. But even disturbances which arise from political and other causes of a different order, ought to be taken into account by both the theoretical economist and the practical man of business, as inseparable from the world and the age in which we live. The present depression of trade has been attributed to various temporary causes—the Franco-German war and

(1) Ricardo's Works, McCulloch's Ed., p. 48.

(2) *Ib.*, p. 49.

its consequences, the war in Turkey, the immense military expenditure through Europe, the demonetising of silver, a succession of bad harvests at home, and famines in India and China. These are not in truth the only causes of the depression, which has arisen in a great measure, as already explained, from conditions inherent in modern economy; but even the temporary occurrences referred to have nothing really abnormal in their character, they are natural incidents of the world and the age, and as such should have been included in the speculations of both economists and men of business. It is written, indeed, that "he that observeth the winds shall not sow, and he that observeth the clouds shall not reap," but he is a poor husbandman who reckons on nothing but fine weather.

The present article has kept the industrial and commercial side of the world chiefly in view, but it would be a fundamental error to regard the economical world as bounded by commerce and industry, or as containing no other phenomena whose laws it is the object of political economy to investigate. The desires for various kinds of wealth are not the only motives on which the production and distribution of wealth depend; the economist must penetrate even into the most romantic passions and sentiments of the human heart. There, too, all is not unknown, or beyond scientific or even commercial prevision. No writer of his time had a keener insight into the secret springs of the movements of society, when he was not in economic leading-strings, than Mr. Bagehot, who has finely observed that "the range and force of some of the finest impulses and affections of young hearts enter largely into the calculations and anticipated profits of the speculative builder." Stop for a twelvemonth marriages of the most sentimental order, those of pure love, and many builders and house-owners will be ruined, many clergymen, lawyers, and doctors impoverished, and a generation hence it will be felt in the labour market and in every trade and profession. But marriages for love will not stop for a twelvemonth; the calculation of the Registrar-General will not be defeated; clerical, legal, and medical functionaries will be employed, and five-and-twenty years hence sons of this year's lovers will be found in every vocation. A critic has severely rebuked the writer for having, in a previous article, controverted Mr. Lowe's proposition that the desire of wealth is the single motive in human affairs on which predictions can be founded, and that "in love, war, and politics prediction is impossible." "He actually," the critic says, "adduces the fact that we can predict within a certain small limit of probable error the number of marriages for any year, as a proof that economic phenomena do not depend on the operation of a single motive. He could not have chosen a more unlucky example, for the merest tiro in statistical inquiry is aware how closely the number of marriages is connected

with the price of grain, and this in all countries. No one can possibly look at the curves representing these two facts without seeing that the price of grain determines the movement of the marriages."<sup>1</sup> The critic would appear to hold that the single motive to marriage is to go shares in a big loaf. But it is true that, although only the poorest class is restrained by the price of corn, when bread is dear many poor persons are unable to marry for love. The curious thing is that in England, among a nation of shopkeepers, marriages are more commonly for love than in France, where the tender passion is supposed to be more easily excited; and that if the love of money be anywhere the single motive from which transactions in the matrimonial market can be foretold, it is at the other side of the Channel. In all countries, however, the forces by which the economic world is moved are many and complex, and it is only by a searching investigation of its actual movements that the laws by which these movements are governed can be known.

It is not meant that deduction has no place in economic science; every inference from or application of a general principle is a deduction. What is meant is that Political Economy has not reached the stage of a deductive science, that the fundamental laws of the economic world are still imperfectly known, and that they can be fully known only by patient induction. The aphorism of Bacon, moreover, respecting the application of human laws, should be constantly present to the mind of the student of economic laws:—"Consequentia non est consequentia; sed sisti debet extensio intra casus proximos: alioqui labetur ad dissimilia, et magis valebunt acumina ingeniorum quam auctoritas legum." The theory of profits, prices, and taxation, referred to in a previous page, affords an instructive instance. That every one desires money is a consequence of the fact that money is the common medium of exchange, and purchases everything. But every subsequent link in the chain of consequences deduced in the orthodox theory is defective—that there is a consequent equality of both wages and profits; that prices are therefore in proportion to cost of production; and that a tax on any special trade or commodity falls necessarily on the consumer, and cannot fall on the producer. Small capitalists have been driven out of several trades by taxation, and it is thus possible that in particular cases so-called indirect taxation, by ruining producers, may cause the stock in trade to be sold at a sacrifice to consumers.

Two conclusions, at least, it is hoped many readers will concur in;—that the economic world is still in a great measure an unknown one, and that to know it, economists must explore it as geographers have explored the world of physical geography.

T. E. C. LESLIE.

(1) *The Statist*, January 4th, 1879.

## REFORM IN VICTORIA.

WRITERS are fond of advocating the study of Greek constitutions for the reason that they present a microcosm of human politics. The study of our own varied colonial constitutions is, however, of more direct use to the political student of to-day, because of the fact that, limited in history and in detail, in past and in present features, like those of ancient Greece, these colonial constitutions present, in addition, a political microcosm made up of the thoughts, the feelings, the men of our own century. The British constitution has, moreover, become the standard of those many modern constitutions which seek by the aid of its example to attain to a well-ordered freedom; to clothe, that is, the power of the people, everywhere pushing to the front, in some sort of staid and trustworthy form.

It is the object of this article to consider one of these constitutions, viz. that of Victoria. We have here a paper bicameral constitution, and this instance has for us an actual as well as a problematic value. Victoria, in her short seventeen years of Parliamentary existence, has suffered much material detriment from Parliamentary deadlocks. She is now emerging from the throes of her latest, and has made up her mind this time determinedly to bring about the much-needed reform. A deputation of leading members of her Parliament has already visited England to ask the ultimate aid of the Imperial authorities to put an end to those grievous constitutional difficulties which local effort has been unable to overcome. In the May number of the *Fortnightly Review* Professor Pearson gave a valuable historical account of these difficulties. I propose here to summarise the present conditions of the whole case, and so to pass to the more urgent question of the remedies desired or desirable.

From the first granting of the Victorian constitution there has been a desire, acquiesced in by the majority and acknowledged by all, for a general assimilation of the two Chambers to the forms and precedents of the English Parliament. Thus section 34 of the Constitution Act enjoins that until standing orders be adopted for any particular case, "resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and usages of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, which shall be followed so far as the same may be applicable to the proceedings of the same Council and Assembly respectively." Thus the *Lex et Consuetudo Parliamenti* became conventionally extended to both Houses; and, as a natural corollary, it came to be held that if the one was to be upheld by the *ægis* of the privileges of the House of Commons, the other was thereby to be placed on the proud constitutional pedestal of the "most august assembly in the

world." This Lords and Commons theory certainly took possession of all minds, political and legal. In the great Darling crisis, such was the avowed view of Lord Cardwell as representing the Colonial Office.

This admitted theory received explicit recognition at the hands of those most interested in 1867. In that year both Council and Assembly respectively agreed to the following resolution in regard to the interpretation of Section 56 of the Constitution Act :—"This House is of opinion that the practice of the Lords and Commons respectively be observed as to money-bills, and as to all subjects of aid and supply; and that each House shall be guided in such matters and forms relating thereto by the precedents established by the House of Lords and by the House of Commons respectively." This is the culminating result of the growth of this Lords and Commons theory, but it is most important to notice that the binding nature of the decision has been since denied, on the curiously technical plea that the two Houses agreed thereto *separately*, and that it could never find a place on the list of the joint standing orders—or orders passed by both Houses in conference, and so *binding* on both. But such objections are only the outward and visible sign that this theory is in reality built upon a foundation of sand. To the unprejudiced student of the case, this straining of Section 35 of the Constitution Act is seen clearly to be at variance with the actually existing state of things. *The elements of the parliamentary government at present existing in Victoria are incapable of supporting a bicameral system strictly analogous to Lords and Commons.* This is the secret of the recurring deadlocks; this the true diagnosis of the intermittent crisis fever. We propose in this article, firstly, to summarise the present condition of things; and lastly, to epitomise such remedies as have been proposed, with the intent to emphasise the fact that the present conditions are ephemeral, and that legislation must regard the future and not merely the present.

The truth of our statement of the present condition of affairs will become self-evident, as soon as attention is given to the constitution and the practice of the two Houses. In regard to their constitution, both the Houses are elective; and they become in some measure representative of definite interests in virtue of the wide difference in the respective conditions of election. The Council, the assumed House of Lords, is composed of members elected to serve till they retire by rotation; and the necessary qualification for candidature is the possession of property of at least £250 annual value. The electors to the Council are, again, the propertied and educated section of the community; in other words, an elector to the Council must be possessed of property of £50 annual value, or hold such certificates of talent or study as a University degree, a



commission in the army or navy, legal qualification as barrister, solicitor, or medical practitioner, or be an officiating minister of religion, or certificated schoolmaster. There are 30,000 such electors on the rolls in Victoria. The Council thus virtually represents the property and the professional interests of the community. This is of more importance when we remember that the ultimate qualification as an elector to the House of Assembly, the assumed House of Commons, is manhood suffrage; and that there is not only no property qualification for membership, but, in addition, a grant, for the present in force, of £300 per annum to each member of the House. The Assembly may thus be said, in more ways than one, to represent the great numerical mass of the community.

The practice of these two Houses also differs materially from that of Lords and Commons; nor is this surprising when we remember the *personnel* of the two Houses. In regard to the Council, first we record the conclusion arrived at by Sir David Wedderburn.<sup>1</sup> "In Victoria the Legislative Council is a representative body with an influential constituency at its back, and considers itself as especially constituted to secure the interests of property." There are members of the Council who themselves publicly and often boast of being elected by, and so becoming representative of, the wealth and intelligence of the community. And they have even held, "in financial matters we are not to be compared with the House of Lords." They rely on the 35th article of the Constitution Act, which they hold implies that the procedure, rights, and other attributes of the Legislature must not exceed those of the Commons' House of Parliament. There are members of the Council, in short, who claim for it the position of a second House of Commons. And when members themselves say this of themselves, bring plausible proof from the paper constitution, and, above all, act up to the views they hold, it boots little to refine on the point as to whether they are legally and constitutionally justified in their conduct.

The reason that they do not always follow the practice of the House of Lords is further illustrated by a recognition of their personal characteristics. As far as regards the electors, the intelligence of Victoria has its place on the rolls and the benches of either House; but the Council has its peculiar power as the mouth-piece of the *wealth* of the community. Its members and their constituents belong to an order which has appeared suddenly and rapidly in the land. It is a class described by Victorians themselves by the opprobrious terms, "wealthy lower orders;" terms savouring strongly of that concise definition of wealth as "that which is accumulated by the industrious and coveted by the idle." This class holds an enormous capital in land, in sheep, in money.

(1) See *Fortnightly Review*, vol. xx. New Series, p. 43.

The individual possessors are, of course, few in number ; nor, indeed, are they necessarily conspicuous for the qualities or attributes usually credited to the wealthy landowners of an old country, and which constitute the base or foundation on which the House of Lords rests and has its being.

The class is largely composed of men who started in life with but little capital ; and in a majority of cases wealth has come to them whether they sought it or not. The rapid natural increase of flocks and herds, thriving on the appropriation of new miles of virgin grasslands, has multiplied cent. per cent. the small invested beginnings. Again, the welcome nuggets of the gold-fields brought a vast inrush of population, which ran up the value of land to a fabulous height, and with a suddenness the story of which is far more surprising than the most extravagant fable. Melbourne, Geelong, Ballarat, and other cities and towns came and occupied men's paddocks, and turned them out of their shepherding huts, but paid them heavy golden compensation. Many men in Victoria were thus surprised into becoming wealthy. In some cases their antecedents were not calculated to add lustre to their new social prominence. There was frequently a want of education, or an absence of those qualities and attributes which only develop through long years of association with the rights and duties of property. We do not for a moment say the whole class was of this composition, but none will deny that there was a preponderating leaven of this type pervading it.

Against many drawbacks of reputation and circumstance, this class had to fight its way to an honourable fame ; and its champion and representative has been the Legislative Council. And this body of wealthy landowners and merchants numbered in its ranks the best pioneer blood ; the bravery and energy which opened up the wilds of the interior ; the skill and perseverance which, by storage of water and other means, won large tracts of country in the face of that curse of Australia, severe drought ; the enterprise and business ability which has made Melbourne the Liverpool of the South ; and generally speaking self-denial and hard work. These are the qualities which gave to the order its opportunities ; which enabled it to make its fortune out of circumstances. But a body thus inspired with the full flood of energy and the boundless aspirations and ambitions of success, must needs have the restraint of a well-ordered mind if it would attain to the lasting success of the same order in an old country. And it is just this element which has not as yet come to the front in Victoria. Nor, indeed, can its appearance be expected till the necessary time shall have elapsed to tone down and sober the first exuberant outbursts of growth. In short, wealth and intelligence in Victoria are in the heyday of youth ; and to look for the existence, under such conditions, of a House of Lords,

## REFORM IN VICTORIA.

is to look for an impossibility. But they are there, and give abundant promise of a manhood which shall render all things possible.

The companion feature in this picture has hitherto suffered a strange neglect, and to this it is our endeavour here to direct special attention. We are told frequently the Council is no counterpart of the House of Lords; yet seldom do we hear the question asked, Is the Assembly a true or efficient copy of the House of Commons? It is obvious that if it be not, we may look in vain, in that bicameral Parliament, of which it is a part, for the possible action of a true House of Lords. Now the electors to the Assembly are very much the same as the electors to the English House of Commons. For though manhood suffrage is the law, yet of the hundred and eighty thousand electors not more than thirty thousand appear on the rolls on the ground of manhood suffrage, the majority claiming the right as ratepayers, &c. And even this thirty thousand is very largely composed of young men, often the sons of the wealthy, who regard such registration as the least cumbersome mode of exercising their *jus suffragii*. As a fact, even the working-class electors of Victoria are exactly equivalent to the well-to-do working-classes of the old country, and at the present there are, practically speaking, no lower strata of labour.

Where the vital difference lies between the Assembly and the House of Commons is in the members themselves. Victoria, of the size of Scotland and England together, is at the present inhabited by about the population of Kent. The men are all hard at work carving out fortunes. Even in those instances where to an outsider the fortune seems already acquired, the life of work is by no means over. In this new community there is, as yet, no extensive class, as in England, of educated, contented, well-to-do men, ready, willing, and ambitious to devote their lives and energies to the national work of legislation and administration. In Victoria this state of things has given rise to the questionable expedient of payment of members, an expedient which experience is rapidly proving to be fraught with more evils than advantages. Three hundred pounds a year, together with a free railway pass, is at present paid to every member of Parliament. It has been held that the amount is wrong. On the one hand, it is too large to be a mere reimbursement of the expenses of attending Parliament, the avowed purpose of the smaller honorarium paid in New Zealand and other places. But, on the other hand, it is too small adequately to repay any man of ability for his devotion of time and work to the purposes of the nation. Three hundred pounds per annum tends rather to introduce into the public service a class of professional politicians, who regard this pittance as a means of subsistence until, by the exertion of the ability to govern his fellows, which every man believes himself to possess, he attain to the emoluments of a minister. In Victoria proof of this is seen in

the class of people who sometimes attain to the higher posts. They are no doubt clever men ; and in their struggles is very apparent the rule of the survival of the fittest. But it is the fittest of a type that does not make *safe* leaders or guides for a community. These men have not the associations of responsibility which long ownership of property induces in its train ; nor have they enjoyed, as a rule, that early training for learned professions at Universities or the Bar which gives to members of the House of Commons a cultured stability, a recognition of the fair claim of other sides and other opinions, which renders extreme measures on the part of that House impossible. Yet these very men are invariably the loudest to make their claims heard, and the most persistent in maintaining a state of things which enables them to float on the surface of society. Time, and its consequent increase of population, will lower the standard of the electors ; all the more needful is it then to raise that of the representatives of the future.

The fact that Council and Assembly fail to follow the practice of the Lords and Commons is amply evident from a glance at history. The usual climax of Parliamentary deadlocks in Victoria is the rejection of the annual Appropriation Bill by the Upper House. Last year saw the fourth instance of such action within the seventeen years of Victorian Parliamentary life. This is in strange contrast to English procedure. In the discussion as to the mutual rights of Lords and Commons upon the Paper Duties Bill in 1860, we find recorded the report made by a committee extending its investigations over two hundred years :—" Bills appropriating supplies amended or rejected by House of Lords—*no case found.*" This exemplifies well the marked and unmistakable difference between the two instances. And in reviewing the conduct of the Council in so often rejecting Supply Bills, contrary altogether to the practice of the Lords, the obvious question arises—Have the conditions been the same ? Have the Lords ever had the same reason for asserting their right of rejection which the Council has had ? By their Constitution Act Victorians bind themselves to follow home precedents " so far as applicable." History shows us that in many cases these precedents, under present conditions, are inapplicable. The Council is asked to condescend to the position of the House of Lords ; yet this is obviously impossible unless the Assembly, on its part, condescend to the position of the House of Commons.

It is our special endeavour here to consider the terms of some agreement for these constitutional warriors, which may be the basis of a lasting peace. We have scanned the nature of the Victorian bicameral system. Its early promise has resulted in an outcome of failure. Victoria has become notorious as the congenial home of Parliamentary deadlocks. When a man is constantly, in regard to his health, in a critical state, the inevitable conclusion is that there

is something wrong with his constitution. And so it is with the body politic; but in this latter case there is the further possibility of so altering the constitution that crises shall no longer occur.

The Victorian constitution has broken down more than once. In the minute of the ministry which resigned in the crisis in May, 1866, such words as the following are *possible*:—"We find ourselves unable to carry on the government, although we have fifty-eight supporters in an Assembly counting seventy-eight members. . . . No Ministry formed from the opposition could carry on her Majesty's Government . . . under our present very imperfect, and, in such crises as the present, almost unworkable constitution." Yet that very crisis was summarily put a stop to by a compromise in which the obstruction of the Council gave way no sooner than the aggression of the Assembly drew in its horns. But with the end of the crisis vanished, as usual, all thought of reform.

There is always an avowal on both sides of a desire to legislate in accordance with the public will, and yet appeals to the people and dissolutions rather embitter than allay the more virulent symptoms of the ailment. The reason is not far to seek. Party feeling rules rampant in Victoria. The crisis of 1866 occurred when Protection was striving for the mastery over Free Trade. In all the great struggles between Assembly and Council, the Council has rejected supplies on the nominal plea of irregularities in form; it has objected not to the matter presented, but to the manner of presentation. Thus the outside world has seen with astonishment the mere prefixing of a free gift preamble—or the embodiment into a Bill of what the Council has regarded as foreign matter—throw the colony into convulsions, seriously damaging to its material prosperity and its reputation. But there are always, underlying these nominal pretexts, real reasons of party politics. A very slight experience of Victorian society soon proves the operation of the adage, "He that is not with me is against me." Neutrality is regarded as an impossibility. If you are not a vigorous ally, you belong to the camp of the enemy. It is the very state of public opinion sought for by the old Greek lawgiver. As a sign of these things we find the epithet revolutionary invariably applied by the one party to the other, in order to lower it in the eyes of the world; yet are these party spirits, for no very occult reason, incapable of successfully revolutionising their "unworkable constitution."

Just as the Battle of the Tariffs lay at the base of the crisis of 1866, so it is generally held that taxation of squatting property is greatly the cause of the latest deadlock. In 1878 the plea of the Council for rejecting the Appropriation Bill was that it had tacked to it an item for payment of members. The squatter majority in the Council hold that the more democratic majority of the Assembly, in passing the Land Tax Bill of 1877, treated their class interests with

gross unfairness; and they hold that payment of members alone enables the ardent spirits, who are the backbone of this majority in the Assembly, to enter the political arena at all; and there to vegetate on £300 a year, to vote religiously for all who uphold this salary, and to look forward to attain, by a due use of their wits, to the £1,500 or £2,000 per annum enjoyed by ministers. The squatters, feeling all this, reject the Appropriation Bill.

During the latest crisis three Bills were thrown out by the Council, and the private history of these episodes is not a little suggestive. In the first place there was the Defence Bill, embodying the advice of Sir W. Jervois; there was unanimous agreement as to the high utility and pressing desirability of adopting this advice at once. But in the Assembly the Bill was passed with a "free gift" preamble. The Council at once declare against this, that it is cutting them off from their constitutional power of amending the Defence Policy, and forthwith reject the Bill. Nominally, this is done not because of its matter, but because of its form. In reality, the Council are convinced that the party in the Assembly hostile to them are by this means attempting a permanent curtailment of their legitimate prerogative; and the very security of the colony, in the midst of warlike rumours, is sacrificed to these party purposes.

Again, a Bill providing for an international exhibition, which it was hoped would induce a leading member of the Royal Family to visit Australia, which was to do great things for commerce and industry, which was to give Melbourne a much-needed permanent exhibition building, is thrown out; and this partly because the Council was piqued at the Ministers proposing a resolution in the Assembly to invite the Royal guest *before* the Bill had been sent up to the Council, and partly because it was a rare opportunity for the Free-Traders to emphasise the evils of Protection by declaring an international exhibition altogether out of place in a Protectionist country.

But the most serious matter is the third case—the rejection of the annual Appropriation Bill for the reasons alluded to above.

This private history of matters, thoroughly acknowledged by all concerned, is fresh evidence, if such were needed, that neither Council nor Assembly act in the spirit of Lords and Commons. Each side allows its party policies to enter upon and regulate the ordinary courtesy and discretion of Parliamentary procedure. We look in vain for that spirit of the House of Commons embodied in Mr. Perceval's words: "If there should be any fair reason to suppose a difference of opinion to exist in that other quarter (the House of Lords), that would be good ground for taking that grant out of the Appropriation Act." The Assembly seems to have forgotten one prominent precedent of the House of Commons, ratified in the Palmer Case, viz.: that if any question enter Ways and Means on

which both Houses even appear to have the right to an expression of opinion, it is always desirable that it should, for expediency's sake, be submitted as a separate measure. In the latest instance the Council actually gave public warning that they objected strongly to the item being placed in the Appropriation Bill; and yet the Assembly do include it, and say to the country: "Now, if the Council reject, the blood be upon their heads." And the Council retort: "If we act constitutionally we are bound to reject this Bill, and so we cast back in your teeth the accusation of revolutionary aims."

Enough, and more than enough, has now been said in proof of our first assertion that the bicameral Parliament in Victoria has failed to attain to the working success of its model; and that the undeniable cause is the essential dissimilarity of its materials. Under differing conditions even similar means will lead to different ends: consequently, if the end sought, viz., the constitutional practice of the English Parliament, remain the same, the means adopted to attain to it must be different.

The cure of this intermittent crisis fever is now to be attempted once again. No doubt the constitutional procedure, both in regard to initiation and legislation, lies, in the first instance, in Victoria itself. But the cry of reform has been ere now raised in Victoria without further effect. Ten years ago Sir Charles Dilke wrote: "The most singular, perhaps, of the spectacles presented by colonial politics during my visit was that of the Victorian Upper House going deliberately into committee to consider its own constitution, with a view of introducing a Bill for its own reform, or to meditate, as its enemies said, upon self-destruction." And yet deadlocks still recur; ten years have reformed nothing of all these evils. The Council has again been deliberately considering its own reform. But this year has at last witnessed a stern, determined reference to the Home authorities. The great material good of a continued citizenship in a British Empire is held to be that its component parts will thereby be enabled to steer clear of the rocks and shoals of a too energetic, too full-blooded political life, on which have been shipwrecked the States of South America, as were those of Mediæval Italy and Ancient Greece. Our colonies are young as yet in political life, and no doubt the substantial and assured progress of the British colony as compared with that of any other nation—no doubt the fact that British colonies have never afforded an instance of civil or inter-colonial war—is largely, if not entirely, due to the circumstance that the energetic first flush of political life called out by the inauguration of self-government in new and young communities, is advised and controlled by means of the Governor, the Colonial Office, and, in the last instance, appeal to the Imperial Parliament—that is, by all the legislative and administrative experience of the very home of Parliamentary government.

Thus Victorians appeal to the Imperial Parliament; and the case to be presented must be discussed betimes. The kindly aid of the Imperial authorities has been invoked. According to the letter and the spirit of the Victorian Constitution, no measure of reform can be legalised without the consent of *both* the Houses. And the respective majorities in these two Houses have long settled down into a rigid opposition to each other. Thus the Imperial wisdom will hardly endeavour to force on the colony the views of either of the two local parties. And it may be added, that from the same high quarters no scheme will be suggested which savours of anything or at variance with the true spirit of Parliamentary government.

For these latter reasons we may at once dismiss from practical and immediate consideration such proposed reforms as would abolish the Council. Of a truth would this be the end of deadlocks: but by means of the annihilation of one of the two parties necessary to their occurrence. The Upper House will hardly agree to its own annihilation. Again, recent history by no means proves the Assembly of Victoria to be, at the present, a safe guardian of the interests of the community. We might instance its violent Protectionist proclivities, which are already enabling her freer neighbours to rival Victoria in her previously undisputed claim to be the premier colony of Australia.

For these same reasons, too, we must regard with suspicion such reforms as seek to set up a *direct* appeal to the electors as a check and prevention of deadlocks. The Ministry at present enjoying the support of the majority in the Assembly of Victoria has proposed that any measure which passes the Assembly in two consecutive sessions, and is twice rejected by the Council, shall be finally disposed of by Plebiscite. This is, in fact, the equivalent of making the Upper House dissolvable, in so far as it is a going to the country for its approval or disapproval of the policy of the majority of that House. But it is more than this; the independence of the Assembly as well is done away with. The proposal has actually brought about a split among the supporters of the Ministry. These dissentients hold, with great show of reason, that such a proposal simply insults and degrades Parliament by virtually ignoring that it represents the people.

There are, however, two classes of reform which we need not reject on grounds either of theory or expediency: and it is in one of these two classes that the actual measures are to be found which shall set all right. Either of these classes would be acceptable in the colony itself, as they have neither of them been adopted by either of the two leading parties; probably for the reason that they neither run to those extremes from which alone effective party cries can be manufactured.

The one class of the possible reforms seeks to leave the two Victorian chambers *legally* what they are at the present *practically*;



viz., two representative bodies *conjointly* representing all majorities, minorities, interests, and classes in the community. The means to this end are that, in the event of disagreement, the two Houses should sit together in joint conference, and the decision of a two-thirds majority be accepted by all as final. This scheme has for precedent the procedure in both the United States and France; where, as in Victoria, the Upper Houses are elective, and universal suffrage prevails. And these reforms are based on the undoubted fact that in Victoria, from what cause soever, representatives of capital and property, the representatives, that is, most concerned with taxation, do seek seats in the Council in preference to the Assembly. This class of reforms is, then, eminently practical.

Another means to the same end is to make the Council dissoluble together with the Assembly. And this is undoubtedly to rob the Upper House of this bicameral Parliament of its senatorial or permanent character. Consequently, it has been objected to such reforms that they are in contravention of the true English theory of Parliament. Yet in the thirty-fifth paragraph of the Victorian Constitution Act we read: "It shall be lawful for the Legislature by any act or acts to define the privileges, immunities, and powers of either Council or Assembly, provided that they shall not exceed those held, exercised, and enjoyed by the Commons' House of Parliament." The *lex et consuetudo Parliamenti* here specifically alluded to, seems as it were, purposely to allow that the literal powers and relations of Lords and Commons need not be binding; and, it may be added, it is but reasonable that much licence must exist where universal suffrage is already conceded. Thus it is that it comes to be held to be both legal and constitutional to give to the Council some technical status other than that of the House of Lords, provided, and so long as, in the aggregate the Council's powers do not exceed those of the Commons' House of Parliament; provided, that is, they remain a House of Parliament; and do not grow into a camarilla, a supreme senate, a thirty tyrants; or in any other mode become possessed of the powers wielded by the many forms which irresponsible oligarchy has taken in history. At the same time due care must be taken that the Assembly do not exceed the privileges, immunities, and powers of the Commons' House of Parliament; in other words, that the Assembly also remain a House of Parliament, and do not grow into an *ἐκκλησία*, a supreme comitium, a four hundred tyrants; or, in any other mode become possessed of the powers wielded by the many forms which irresponsible ochlocracy has taken in history.

The other class of practicable reforms boasts far greater pretension to philosophical correctness. It is proposed to modify the composition of both Houses, so as to assimilate them more in character to their nominal models, the Lords and Commons. Such reforms take into consideration the actualities of the present, and the more

certain probabilities of the future, of the political development of Victoria. The Assembly is to be made representative of *all* interests in the community. Property is to have more voice. Various schemes have been suggested to this end: some advocate the granting extra votes to ratepayers. But the most effectual course will be found in the abolition or modification of payment of members. This system is only on its trial at present in Victoria. We have already discussed its tendencies. It would seem desirable, even if its total abolition be left till future growth shall supply Victoria with men of means ready to serve the country, that at all events the system should be now modified, at least so far as to make it a mere reimbursement of the necessary expenses of attendance, and not, as at present, an actual livelihood. But the main feature of these reforms is the proposed transformation of the Upper House. It is no longer to compete with the Lower House in the *representation* of any interests whatever, but is simply to take up the much-needed constitutional position of a wholesome check on purely party or reckless legislation. The means to this end is the substitution of nomination for election. South Australia, the steady-going and sober neighbour of excitable Victoria, finds its own elected Upper House work badly, and is proposing the substitution of nomination. In the Dominion of Canada nomination has been substituted with great success for election, which proved a failure in regard to the Upper House. New Zealand and New South Wales afford successful examples of Upper Houses nominated and not elected. And it is noteworthy that where elective Upper Houses still flourish—to wit, in Tasmania and the Cape—manhood suffrage does not exist.

It may be noted that even in the present state of political development in Victoria, a nominated Council can be formed of the best minds in the colony. The simple expedient named is to nominate, on *ex-officio* grounds, all who have attained to leading positions in the community—political, social, commercial, scientific, and municipal. This would ensure for the Upper House wisdom, technical skill on all points, and the respect of the people. The liberty to nominate a certain proportion of other members would give to the Constitutional Government for the time being that powerful hold over obstructive cliques which the English Crown has found a most useful adjunct to Constitutional Government.

We have briefly detailed two possible classes of reform. It remains only to add that it has been thought desirable to leave it to Victorians themselves to decide which class of schemes they may choose as the path that shall for the whole future lead them clear of Parliamentary deadlocks. The various authorities interested have two distinct questions before them. The one the matured form that the Victorian constitution is finally to assume, and the other the prevention of deadlocks during the present ephemeral epoch of Victorian

life. It is perhaps worth while for the moment to assume that the first question had best be left for future determination, and that the Victorian community may be trusted as it becomes, in the inevitable course of events, more developed in political knowledge, to seek of itself to satisfy the Parliamentary instincts of a more staid and full-grown British community. With the aid of this assumption we can abstract from all surrounding matter some simple means for preventing Parliamentary deadlocks under existing conditions.

The Victorian Upper House itself suggested such a remedy; but this remedy assumes that deadlocks result from nothing more than a rejection of the Appropriation Bill, and that the Upper House only rejects Appropriation Bills when they contain items objectionable to that House. The remedy is contained in the proposition that the Bill itself be always passed, but that if the Council take objection to any item, such objection is to be submitted to the decision of extra-colonial arbitrators, and the item retained or rejected in accordance with such decision. But we have seen that it is the opposition of the parties that rule in each House—it is men, and not measures, that bring about deadlocks. In Victoria the Government carry one House with them, and the Opposition the other. For instance, the two Houses have found it quite impossible to come to terms even on the common ground of the much-needed reform of the constitution. A right temporary remedy will seek to pit the two parties together in a constitutional arena. The Austrian and Norwegian constitutions offer suggestions. The Storting divides itself into two distinct and permanent committees—the Odelsting and the Lagting—and when these two cannot agree, they join themselves together again for the nonce and vote in union. The two component parts of the Austrian Delegations, the Hungarian and the Austrian, when they fail to agree in their separate resolves, sit together in joint council for the single purpose of voting, but all further debate is forbidden. It is proposed then that when the two Victorian Houses cannot agree they should sit in joint committee on the question at issue, and that some sufficient majority should be accepted as a final decision of the point. Such a measure has the great merit of simplicity; it has the merit, too, of being acceptable to all local parties, provided, of course, it is instituted as avowedly temporary—temporary, that is, as being a mere precursor of some final alteration of the constitution; as being a mere palliative which shall tide over the difficulties of the present, and so render possible due and efficient preparation for the future. Yet it has the necessary merit of absolute efficacy for the prevention, so long as it is put in practice, of the source of all Victoria's political ills—Parliamentary deadlocks. It is a sure preventive of the attacks of crisis fever until such time as the constitution shall become altered, and newly set up no longer obnoxious to such attacks.

G. BADEN POWELL.

## HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

So far as the domestic history of the past month is concerned, Ireland is the chief centre of political interest. Parliament has been busied with the consideration of questions which touch at several separate points Irish interests, Irish rights, Irish sensibilities. It has been asked to legislate on the land question, on the question of university education; and on the right of Irishmen to organize volunteer corps. In addition to this there might be mentioned the movement that has received already the sanction of Parliament for abolishing the Convention Act, and conceding to Ireland the privilege, within certain limits, of holding political meetings as in England. In each of these matters the attitude of the two great parties in the State has been instructive. The cordial, and even enthusiastic, approval given by the Government and the Opposition to the Volunteer Corps Bill, marks, so far as the sentimental aspect of Irish politics is concerned, quite as much a new point of departure as, Mr. Lowe rightly said on Wednesday last, had been arrived at in the matter of university education.

The omens are still more noticeable in the case of the advance which has been made in the direction of Irish land reform. It is not so long ago that the idea of a Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer throwing over an Irish Secretary, and accepting such a principle as that involved in Mr. Lefevre's Resolution on the second of this month, would have been scouted as impossible. Here we may recognise symptoms of the assertion of the power of political ideas on the minds of a party traditionally inaccessible to ideas. The fact is at last allowed by the official representatives of Toryism, that the precise conditions which govern agriculture in England do not govern it in Ireland, and that in view of this divergence, it may not be amiss to be guided by the experience of other European countries. The object of Mr. Lefevre's motion was so fully explained by Mr. Thornton in a recent number of this Review, that we need not here give a detailed account of its scope. Briefly it may be explained as having for its purpose the assimilation of the working of the Irish Landed Estates Court to that of the Irish Church Temporalities Commission, the extension, in other words, to the former of the inducements and facilities afforded under the latter to peasants to become proprietors. The really surprising novelty was to hear the Conservative leader of a Conservative House of Commons admitting the force of such arguments as those urged by the author of the resolution. To this class of arguments we refer Mr. Lefevre's statements that Ireland is behind all other countries of the world in the work of creating a class of small landlords; that, while in France nearly two-thirds of the land is owned by persons possessing less than seventy-five acres each, and in Switzerland more than two-thirds by proprietors the average of whose territorial possessions is

less than seventy acres, in Ireland not a two-hundred-and-fiftieth part of the land is in the ownership of persons having less than fifty acres each. Now, in Ireland the land is cultivated by 600,000 tenants, with an average of between thirty-two and less than thirty acres apiece. There are 16,000 landlords, of whom 12,000 only have more than 100 acres, two-thirds of the total area of the country belonging to rather less than two thousand persons.

Here then, it cannot be doubted, is a case—and it is a great thing for the Government to have recognised this much—in which the conventional arguments urged against peasant proprietorship wholly fail to apply. On the one hand, we have the experience of France to support the hypothesis that there is presumptive evidence in favour of the scheme; on the other hand, the experience of England is without anything from which it can be analogically inferred that the reform is inexpedient, much less dangerous. It may be granted that of late years signs have been witnessed of the development of an Irish middle class, and of course the tendency will be for the country to become more commercial and less agricultural. But agriculture will still remain the staple pursuit of Ireland; and if it be said that the multiplication of small holdings will be followed by unwieldy additions to the population, the answer which suggests itself is that there will be a corresponding increase in those opportunities of emigration of which Irishmen have never been slow to avail themselves. It is at least impossible to object to the proposal for the reasons that are adduced against it as valid in the case of England. In Ireland there is no question whatever of the introduction of a new principle. The lines on which Mr. Lefevre's resolution proceeds are the lines on which the Irish territorial system is administered. Peasant proprietorship, or something very like it, is the foundation of that system. It has been recognised in the two greatest measures passed by an English parliament of late years. All that Mr. Lefevre does is to urge that it shall have fuller and more favourable opportunities than it has yet enjoyed.

While, in these matters Irish legislation does not offer any exact precedent for England, and consequently any arguments drawn from England against such legislation are inadmissible, it will not do to ignore the fact that in the long run the spirit of Irish land reform may react upon England. Our meaning may be conveniently illustrated by two measures which have been brought forward in the course of the last fortnight in the two Houses of Parliament; the first, Mr. Shaw's Landlord and Tenant Bill, the second reading of which was refused by the House of Commons by a majority of 172—263 to 91—May 14; the other, Lord Belmore's Tenant Right Bill, negatived by the Peers, without a division, on Tuesday, May 20. It will be sufficient description of the second of these measures to say that it aimed at definitely recognising the legal validity of the Ulster tenant right in the case of farms let on lease, as well

as, in those let by annual covenant. Serious objections to the proposal there were, of course, none forthcoming, and the subject is chiefly to be noted because it affords a further illustration of the ministerial consciousness of the expediency of avoiding everything which can just now alienate the Irish vote. The Bill was brought forward by Lord Belmore; it was strongly supported by the Lord Chancellor; the Prime Minister refused to accede to Lord Granville's request that he should urge Lord Belmore to withdraw the measure. Mr. Shaw's Landlord and Tenant Bill was a different affair. It aimed not merely at a special and emphatic interpretation of a measure already in existence, as did Lord Belmore's, but at enlarging the area covered by a particular custom. Its object was, in fact, to extend to the whole of Ireland the tenant right of Ulster—to give Irish tenants the power of securing themselves in their holdings without being subject to the confiscation of their property by an advance of rent. The amount of State interference in this matter is little more than that conditionally sanctioned by the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1876 in England. It is less than exists, to the allowed and universal interest of the community, in the factory acts and shipping acts. It, or something like it, becomes a simple matter of justice when it is remembered that it was said, in the course of the debate, Irish tenants are not like English tenants, voluntary contractors, but obliged in the great majority of cases to accept any terms that the landlord may impose. It is a significant commentary on the wisdom of such legislation as this that the measure should have received the support both of Mr. Howard, the newly-elected member for East Cumberland, who is not likely to underrate the sacred right of territorial proprietorship, and of Mr. Herschell, whose name in such a context may be regarded as almost a synonym for judicial moderation. What is the exact position in which such legislation as this, in the case of Ireland, stands to legislation in the same department of politics in England? That it will stimulate the desire among English tenant farmers to secure fixity of tenure one cannot doubt. The plea of the English tenant farmers at the present time is as definite and intelligible as it is just. What they want is not peasant proprietorships, but fixity of tenure. In other words, they ask that the Agricultural Holdings Act shall cease to be permissive, and shall become compulsory. The future of English agriculture is in the direction of market gardening; the future of Irish agriculture lies in the chances of agricultural improvement. The condition of life and civilization in the two countries are essentially different. Hence, while by doing that which is just and expedient for Ireland you may emphasize the demand for that which is equitable and convenient for England, you cannot make what is exclusively suitable for Ireland suitable also for England. Here we may mention, as an illustration of our argument, a commendable policy

adopted by an English landlord. Lord Tollemache has not only just made a considerable remission of rent to his tenants, but has pledged himself to the payment of liberal compensation for unexhausted improvements, and has conceded to his tenants a lease note giving them undisturbed possession for twenty-one years. This we believe to be an instance of the salutary manner in which, and the limits within which, Irish legislation may be expected to react on English feeling.

Passing to the question of University education, there has been witnessed a noticeable step in the direction of the settlement of a complicated and long-standing difficulty. No person who happened to be in the House of Commons on the afternoon of May the 21st can fail to have been profoundly impressed by the spirit in which the O'Connor Don's Bill was discussed on both sides. The confession was placed on national record by the representatives equally of the Government and the Opposition that something should be done to equalise, in reality as well as in name, the opportunities of academic culture enjoyed by Irish Protestants and Catholics. Theoretically, of course, these opportunities are equal already. The same Universities and the same colleges are open to different denominations, but so far as the enormous majority of Roman Catholics are concerned they are practically non-existent. They are unfavourably regarded by the priests, and the pious multitude mostly obeys its priests. That is briefly the case for the O'Connor Don's Bill. The measure was based upon the practical, though not the professed, recognition of the truth that the machinery of University education in Ireland for Catholics is without any adequate endowment. It aimed at providing this endowment in an adroit manner, and one as little likely as possible to offend Protestant prejudices. It proceeded to apply to Ireland, on a higher educational level, the same principle which on a lower one the legislature has established in England—the support of denominational schools and colleges out of public money. Nor even in Ireland is this principle unrecognised by the Government. The Intermediate Education Act of last year logically involves the policy of concurrent denominational endowment. In the course of the debate on Wednesday last, the Chancellor of the Exchequer denied that the two cases were identical or even closely alike, and it is true that the O'Connor Don's measure contemplates the establishment and endowment of an entire apparatus of education—museums, laboratories, class rooms—which was not required by the ministerial measure of a twelvemonth since. The O'Connor Don would not have received the support of the Irish priesthood which it may be fairly assumed he has secured, unless his bill promised them a good deal more than payment by results. But so far as principle is concerned, the measure is not in advance of the measure of last year, or for the matter of that of the Education Act of 1870.

Thus the promoters of the Bill came before the House of Commons

with facts and logic both on their side. The circumstances are what they declare them to be; the grievance is as palpable as Mr. Lowe proclaimed. The precedent would have a binding force were it not for the solvent of religious antagonism which it has to encounter. That sentiment has caused the English Government and the English Parliament to place themselves in an anomalous position. It was allowed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and other speakers on the Ministerial side, as well as by Liberals, that Irish Catholic University Education was not in a state satisfactory to those most immediately concerned—the Catholics themselves. The next thing was for the House of Commons to proclaim its impotence to introduce the desiderated reform. One honourable member suggested the affiliation of a new Catholic college to an old Protestant university. Another was for reducing the million and a half. A third declared that nothing could be done towards finding the money till Parliament knew a great deal more about the manner in which the endowment was to be administered. This last was in fact the contention of the Cabinet. Sir Stafford Northcote complained that the measure did not furnish guarantees against the application of money forthcoming from the surplus fund of the Irish Church, in a manner strictly prohibited by Parliament when that Church was disendowed.

There remains a consideration which might have been urged with considerable effect by the authors of the bill, and by her Majesty's Ministers had they decided to give it their support. It may be undeniable that the colleges which will profit from the new endowments will be those resorted to by Catholic students—though, for the matter of that, there would be nothing to prevent the Senate affiliating an Anglican or Presbyterian seminary, so as to be able to deny the absolute application of the principle discovered in the measure. But if the colleges will be Catholic, they will receive the emoluments of the measure, not in their capacity of schools of Catholic doctrine, but of secular culture. The bill says not one word about Catholic or Protestant. It provides for the election of a senate whose composition might be cited as furnishing an adequate security against the influences of a narrowing ecclesiasticism. What objection, it might thus with some plausibility be asked, could there be to proceeding to the discussion of a measure conceived in this spirit? The endowment of Roman Catholicism, which the measure would carry with it, is not direct, but indirect, and if a Roman Catholic youth reaches a certain standard of merit in arts, physics, engineering, or law, he has as much a claim to the reward of the State as if he belonged to any other religion, or no religion at all. As we have seen, there is exceedingly little in the assertion that the State has resolved to endow no more denominational institutions. It does endow such institutions already, and every attempt to discredit them in England is stigmatised as the impious effort of a visionary



and impracticable fanaticism. In the matter of the primary schools of Great Britain, we are always told, when anything is said on the subject, that the national feeling is in favour of the preservation of the mixed system of voluntary or religious and secular schools. In Ireland, the same argument is applied to the case of Roman Catholicism, and the very persons who allow its validity in the case of Protestantism, deny that it is the sort of thing which statesmanship can recognise. Thus we witness those who appeal to sentiment against principle in England, condemning sentiment on the ground of principle in Ireland.

The perpetual adjournment of this question is a scandal to English statesmanship and to English toleration. It is monstrous to deplore the aggressive cupidity or the bigotry of Roman Catholicism in such a context. There is neither more of bigotry nor rapacity in the present demand of the Irish Catholics, than in the contention of the Irish and English Protestants. Bigotry is not the exclusive note of any one church, but the common quality of all. Intolerance is innate in every variety of dogmatic religion. It is even innate in some sorts of irreligion. When, therefore, an English government resist such a demand as that which is now made, on the ground that it is inconsistent with their principles to concede it, they are guilty of a manifest fallacy. Principle has in reality nothing to do with the matter. The State does not regard it as an axiomatic condition of policy to refuse all help to denominational institutions. Ministers do in this affair precisely what they consider expedient. They cannot even honestly say that they were prevented on Wednesday last from supporting the second reading of the O'Connor Don's Bill by, as Sir Stafford Northcote *inter alia* hinted, an apprehension that the degrees of the New University should not come up to the proper standard, and that the million and a half should be eventually at the exclusive disposition of the Irish Catholic priesthood. As regards the former of these pleas, it implies that the authorities of the New University should consent to commit academic suicide. Unless a St. Patrick's degree is recognised as a hall-mark of competence and worth in the professional and secular world, students will not care to avail themselves of it. As regards the latter assertion, it is enough to point to the governing body of the University. It is only upon the assumption that the Senate will consent to a policy of effacement, that the contingency of the absorption of a million and a half by the Roman hierarchy for political ends can be realised. The true explanation of the ministerial attitude in this business of an Irish University, is now what it has always been. Ministerial generosity and justice are limited by fear, not of what Roman Catholicism may ultimately do with the concession, but of the effects which such a concession, or the mere proposal of such a concession, may have on political followers.

If we look on the Continent, we shall fail to find much

that can be said to have any special interest or importance for an English public. To mention the Greek claims is only to be brought back at once from the Hellenic Monarchy to the French Republic. Whether we speak of Athens or Alexandria, the chief point that concerns England is the commentary furnished directly or indirectly on the relations of France and England. In both cases these relations have assumed an unsatisfactory character, and in both cases from the same cause. We entered into a kind of concert with France, the object of which was better administration of Egypt. The Governments of the two countries did in reality officially identify themselves with this ill-judged interference. The dispatch of Mr. Rivers Wilson was as significant in its way as that of M. Blignières. The enterprise was inconsiderately and rashly entered upon. It has been ignominiously abandoned, and in a manner which has caused a cloud of suspicion to rise between the two countries. There was not the slightest necessity for the interchange of acrimonious articles on the subject between the ministerial newspapers of London and the official or semi-official press of Paris. The whole difficulty is perfectly gratuitous. Two great powers cannot act together, in a large business, unless they have an identity of interest, or have agreed upon certain points to differ. The representatives of the Government now complain of the unreasonableness of the French public in supposing that England can have the same policy at heart in Egypt as France. To France the paramount object is the payment of the debt; to England the keeping clear of the "great passages of imperial communication," and the custody of the Canal shares. But why was not this discovered and proclaimed months ago? Why were we unnecessarily exposed to the risk of undertaking a fool's mission? It is said that both France and England agreed to trouble themselves only with the financial aspects of the Egyptian problem. But in Egypt finance is everything, and financial administration opens up the door to every kind of political and imperial issue.

The remarks which are applicable in the case of Egypt hold nearly equally good in that of Greece. Here again the complaint of British perfidy and selfishness is heard. England, it is said, arranged with France to support the Hellenic claims. The thirteenth protocol, the French press protests, embodies not merely a score of recommendations, but of resolutions. The time has come for giving effect to them, and once more England hangs back and holds aloof in the familiar discreditable fashion. It is Syria one day, Egypt the next, Greece the third. No matter which it be, says M. Gambetta's organ, the result is the same. France is deceived by the fine promises of England, pledges herself to the accomplishment of a specific and arduous task, and then when the hour comes for the redemption of the pledge, finds that she has been a dupe. We may be pardoned for saying that we recognise in this petulant outburst signs of a rather remarkable inconsist-

ency, and shortness of memory. When M. Gambetta and his newspaper talk about having been misled by England, in whom did they recognise the representative of English policy? In our chief plenipotentiary at the Berlin Congress, in Lord Beaconsfield. At the time when the great international conclave was being held, no praise was too fulsome for the English Premier from a certain coterie of French admirers. He was an embodiment of heroism and resolution, the "aged statesman in whose heart alone the spirit of English policy still lived." Such was M. Gambetta's view then. It was also that of the French Government, and now the process of disillusioning is being gone through. It was not England that deceived France, it was France which courted the melodramatic deception practised upon it by Lord Beaconsfield. The whole history of the present development of the Greek question, like that of the Egyptian question, points a moral of which the natural emphasis scarcely needs accentuation, against the novel and eccentric intermeddling of our foreign policy. We are promised a crusade in the cause of righteousness; we find that it is only a disreputable escapade in the interest of the Stock Exchange.

While the appearance of one episode in the Eastern question, the Greek claims, is profoundly unsatisfactory, it is agreeable to be able to add that its Asiatic developments have about them much which is reassuring. The Afghan war is at an end; the war with Burmah is averted. As regards the latter, there seems reason to believe that Lord Lytton displayed much firmness and judgment. Strongly urged to do so, when the news of the atrocities perpetrated by a mad monarch spread a sensation through Anglo-Indian official circles which can only be compared to that which was produced in this country when the news of the Bulgarian outrages arrived in the summer and autumn of 1876, the Viceroy declined to dispatch a mission of military vengeance, and curbed the martial enthusiasm of some of his counsellors. In reference to the termination of the war in Afghanistan, it is, we may hope, not premature to congratulate ourselves on the signature of a treaty of peace with Yakoob Khan. But before much is said on that point it would be as well to know what are our future responsibilities in Afghanistan. Is it possible to rely upon the faith of the Ameer's successor, when we have sheathed the sword? What is the measure of confidence which Yakoob has in the good faith of England after his father's experiences of English promises in the matter of native residents? What will be the expenditure involved by the new scientific frontier? What equivalent are we giving Yakoob Khan for his concessions to us? Is it an equivalent in the shape of a guarantee of the permanence of his dynasty, or a piece of territory? These are, each of them, facts on which we must have fuller and more positive knowledge before we can affirm that the Afghan troubles are at an end.





